



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 052
Thursday, November 6, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 6, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*English*]

COMMISSIONER OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay before the House, pursuant to subsection 23(5) of the Auditor General Act, the fall 2025 reports from the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), these reports are deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and in accordance with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Agreement between Canada and Ukraine on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Customs Matters”, done at Kyiv on August 24.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of presenting, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, entitled “Review of Statutory Instruments”. If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the report later today.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-255, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (mischief—religious property).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table my private member’s bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code as it relates to mischief to religious property. I would like to thank my colleague, the member for Thornhill, for seconding the bill.

Over the past 10 years, there has been an alarming increase in incidents of mischief committed against religious property in Canada. Churches, synagogues, mosques and other places of worship continue to be vandalized. The proposed legislation seeks to shift the financial burden caused by vandalism from the victim to the criminal. It would also expand the scope to cover all mischief directed at places of worship, not just hate-motivated mischief.

While some of the punishments proposed in the bill are novel, there are strong similarities to the measures addressing vandalism of war memorials already in the Criminal Code.

I hope all members will join me in supporting Canadians of all faiths.

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

* * *

• (1005)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the first report of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, presented to the House earlier today, be concurred in.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

The Speaker: 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)

* * *

PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester have started a petition.

[English]

I am pleased to present a petition signed by 1,765 Canadians regarding the eligibility rules for the GST new housing rebate for first-time homebuyers.

The petitioners note that the rebate is based on the purchase agreement date rather than the closing date, which unfairly excludes many first-time homebuyers of preconstruction homes, who will pay GST upon closing.

[Translation]

They are calling on the Minister of Finance and National Revenue to base eligibility on the closing or possession date to ensure fairness and consistency for all first-time homebuyers.

[English]

OPIOIDS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of my constituents to present four petitions.

The first is on behalf of angered parents at Abbotsford Traditional School. B.C. Housing is proposing a safe consumption site across the street from the school playground. Parents do not want this to happen, and they have called upon the Government of Canada to cease all funding to B.C. Housing until it respects the rights and the innocence of children.

The second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of residents in Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford concerning the B.C. decriminalization project. This project has been in place for a number of years now, and residents of British Columbia are concerned that the number one cause of death for youth is drug overdose and drug toxicity. Parents and citizens of British Columbia are calling upon the Government of Canada to cease its special agreement with my province, in order to save lives, and to take a different approach that focuses on recovery, not on giving free drugs to people who need hospitalization and care in a safe facility.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition I would like to present today is on behalf of gurdwaras and churches in Abbotsford that are calling upon the government to reject recommendations 429 and 430 in the finance

committee report last year. Churches and gurdwaras in my riding do incredible work to house the poor, to feed people and to take care of the sick. We want them to continue that good work and not lose their charitable status in the process.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the final petition I am raising today is on behalf of British Columbians who are concerned about the overwhelming increase in human trafficking. We need to strengthen our laws in Canada, and petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to mimic legislation in the United States, which would have harsher penalties and capacities to stop the evil people who traffic young people and workers in our country.

● (1010)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, in this week of remembrance, as we think of our veterans, this petition is particularly appropriate. Members of the public have asked their members of Parliament to bring forward the following for the House of Commons to consider.

In 1948, Canada signed and also led the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We pledged to achieve, in conjunction with the United Nations, promotion of the universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. These calls, the petitioners note, were echoed by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the adoption by Canada of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. At the same time, globally, Canada is upholding, we hope, the basic calls for justice, equality, freedom, security, well-being and the prevention of conflict and war.

Petitioners call upon Parliament to consider that with the closing of the Pearson Centre, of course named for a late, former prime minister, the only Canadian prime minister to ever achieve the Nobel Peace Prize, without campaigning for it, I should note, we need a new centre to pursue excellence for peace and justice, based on research; non-partisan education; and training in conflict resolution, diplomacy and peace operations for Canadian civilians, police and military personnel in the context of multilateralism and in the international community, where Canada has traditionally taken the leading role.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Budget

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from November 5 consideration of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government and of the amendment.

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with the member for Calgary East.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have presented a reckless and irresponsible deficit budget. To be clear, I cannot support this budget as it now stands. Canadians deserve an affordable budget for an affordable life. Unfortunately, there is nothing for ordinary Canadians in this budget.

The Liberals decided to continue to rack up debt for future generations to pay off. They are continuing to spend with a deficit of more than \$78 billion. That is going to cost \$1,900 per Canadian. To be clear, this deficit is unacceptable.

In the December 2024 economic statement, the Liberals projected a \$43.2-billion deficit. During the election campaign, the Prime Minister promised that the deficit would not exceed \$62 billion. The day before yesterday, the Liberals broke their promise. The Prime Minister broke his promise. Who will pay the price? Future generations. It is important to point out to Canadians how much the Liberals will add to the national debt in the coming years.

This year, 2025-26, they will add \$78 billion. They have already forecast a deficit of \$65 billion for 2026-27, \$64 billion for 2027-28, \$58 billion for 2028-29, and \$57 billion for 2029-30. That means a total of \$322 billion will be added to Canada's debt over the next five years. Our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren will have to pay off this debt. I have to say that I would not be surprised if this deficit increases even more.

That is the legacy the Liberals want to leave our children. That is the legacy they want to leave our grandchildren. This is their idea of a generational budget? It is disgraceful. They are basically maxing out four, five or six credit cards and leaving the bill for our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren to pay off, yet they have the nerve to call this a generational budget.

We cannot allow the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to throw dust in our eyes. They can divide the deficit into as many columns as they wish, be it two, three, four, five or six columns, but no matter how many times they divide it, at the end of the day, the columns get added up and produce one big deficit. That is what we have here.

Members will recall that when the Liberals came to power, Canada's deficit was \$700 billion. It has now ballooned to almost \$1.400 trillion, and it will keep growing over the next five

years by more than \$300 billion. Our party has been talking quite a lot about the fact that the current deficit means costs and sacrifices for future generations. After 10 years of Justin Trudeau's deficits, Canadians are paying the price, and the current Prime Minister's government is still the same government.

Now let us look at the interest on the debt. It will be \$55.6 billion for fiscal year 2025-26, and it will only continue to grow as hundreds of billions of dollars are added to the national debt over the next few years. The interest on the debt will be \$60 billion in 2026-27, \$66.2 billion in 2027-28, \$71.4 billion in 2028-29, and in excess of \$76 billion in 2029-30. At this point, I am certain that it will keep rising and it will be even more catastrophic.

• (1015)

Allow me to put this into context. Interest on the debt currently sits at \$55.6 billion and now exceeds the amount the government spends on the Canada health transfer for all provinces, which is \$54.7 billion. Interest payments on the debt are costing more than all the money given to health care systems across the country. The government would rather take that money, throw it away and give it to the big bankers instead of investing it in our health care. The health care system is very important to my constituents, and I am certain that all Canadians feel the same way. Unfortunately, the government is spending less money on the health care system than it is on interest payments on the debt.

It gets even crazier. On Thursdays, Canadians pay taxes on their paycheques, and every time they make a purchase, they pay more taxes, such as the GST. The total amount of GST collected across the country in one year is \$54.4 billion. This means that the total amount Canadians pay in GST across the country each year is not even equal to what is paid in interest on the debt.

We cannot support a budget like this. The government keeps leading Canada down a path where taxpayers will have to hand over billions of dollars to bankers for decades. Over the past two days, I have spent about 10 hours studying this budget. I noticed that the government has announced about 12 new programs. It is one thing to come up with new programs, but I want to know which ineffective programs will be cut. Programs are being added, another layer is being added, but nothing is ever taken away. That is the Liberals for you. The government is adding programs, adding spending, adding bureaucracy and adding waste. Eventually, Canadian taxpayers always get stuck with the bill. We have to eliminate Liberal waste and clean house. That is what we are proposing, yet the Liberals persist in adding new programs and new structures.

The Budget

Take, for example, Build Canada Homes, a new development structure that was added. That is great. How many more public servants are being hired? Also, if we divide the total amount by the number of units the Liberals announced in their budget, we get a cost of \$3.2 million per unit. At a price like the one proposed under the new Build Canada Homes program, I have no doubt that entrepreneurs will be lining up in Richmond—Arthabaska to offer their services. It is completely disproportionate. What concerns me is the continued waste and recklessness.

The Liberal government has abandoned even its weak fiscal anchors. Maintaining a declining debt-to-GDP ratio is no longer a priority for this government. The debt-to-GDP ratio continues to rise at a rate of almost 2%. This is simply irresponsible.

The Liberal government no longer has any fiscal anchors. This is not a serious budget. We cannot live with such huge deficits. On our side of the House, we made proposals to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue, but he turned a deaf ear. For instance, we hoped to see the hidden taxes on food scrapped, the taxes on jobs reduced, housing built, money invested in energy, and the inflationary taxes eliminated. None of that is in the Liberals' 2025 budget. We asked the government to limit its deficit to \$42 billion, as set out in its last budget update. It was not us who proposed that figure; the government put it in its last budget update. It said it would be no more than \$42 billion. Now it is \$78 billion. The government is still spending recklessly.

• (1020)

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that I will continue to analyze this budget and the public finances and that I will always be there for the people of Richmond—Arthabaska and for all Canadians.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would argue that a false argument is being presented by the side opposite. When we look at how we are investing in Canada with Canadians, we are determined to build the strongest economy in the G7. That is the goal, and we will achieve that goal with the Prime Minister.

When we talk about the debt, we should recognize that Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. When we talk about the deficit, Canada has the second-lowest deficit in the G7. Only Japan has done better. We are one of two countries in the G7 who have a AAA credit rating.

Why does the member opposite not agree that it is time to build Canada strong? Why did the Conservatives not move an amendment?

[*Translation*]

Eric Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the way should be embarrassed to stand up here. He should be embarrassed to face his children and his grandchildren. We actually asked the Governor of the Bank of Canada about the G7 yesterday. I would invite the member to go listen to the testimony at the Standing Committee on Finance.

We Conservatives are going to keep trying to put money back in the pockets of Canadians, who are currently struggling because of the Liberals' mismanagement.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his first speech on the budget. He talked about recklessness and waste. I agree with him on that and on several other points. I would like to know whether he shares my opinion on one thing in particular.

We already knew that oil companies were getting tax credits to the tune of \$83 billion until 2035. This budget extends those credits until 2040. Now, oil companies will be getting \$100 billion in the form of tax credits.

Is that not a fine example of the government's wastefulness and recklessness? What does my colleague think?

Eric Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, Canada has great wealth in its natural resources. We have wealth beneath our feet. We need to develop our natural resources. That is how we will build a strong Canada.

• (1025)

Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Quebec, who delivered a very good speech with a lot of very important messages for Canadians.

Our country has a major affordability problem right now.

[*English*]

We need to see more being done to address the issues of affordability for everyday Canadians, including our seniors. There was nothing in this budget that addressed the needs of seniors throughout this country. Many of them are on fixed incomes and cannot afford to make ends meet. It is getting increasingly more challenging for them every day that goes by.

Can my colleague address the issue of the often forgotten in our country, namely our seniors?

[*Translation*]

Eric Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this budget for our seniors. Let me tell the House what is in this budget.

Conservatives are in favour of cutting taxes. Where are the Liberals choosing to cut taxes? They are choosing to cut taxes on luxury boats and yachts instead of helping our seniors. That is what the Liberals are choosing to do. They will have to live with their choices.

[*English*]

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, is anyone really better off in Canada than they were before? Will this budget make life any more affordable or safer?

The Budget

We thought Justin Trudeau was the worst money manager in Canadian history. The current Prime Minister makes him look like Scrooge, because he just delivered the most expensive budget in Canadian history outside of COVID. In fact, he will double Justin Trudeau's deficit, if members can believe that. It is unfathomable that in this budget, the Liberal government just slammed, on top of all the other taxes and expenses, another \$5,400 of costs onto Canadian households. It is an empty-promise budget.

Is anyone better off? I am looking at the 2.2 million Canadians waiting in a food bank line every single month, 700,000 of whom are children. I am thinking about the seniors who have to choose between eating and heating, or the single mom who goes to the grocery store and sees that Liberal inflation on food has made everything more expensive. In fact, food inflation is twice the bank's target and is growing 50% faster in cost here than it is in the U.S. That single mom has to choose what she can pick out for her kids this week, whether it is nutritious or not, because more nutritious food is more expensive under the Liberal government. Will she have to sacrifice and go hungry so her kids can be fed?

When we look at this budget, there is absolutely nothing inside it for the everyday Canadian. I remember that when I moved here with my family, people could get by with just one income. In elementary school, I remember getting a paper route to help out at home. We did not come here with much. We lived through very harsh poverty. We used to stand in line for low-income bus passes. However, there was a hope. With hard work, back then people could have an affordable life. They could afford groceries and housing, and most importantly, they could live in safe neighbourhoods.

After 10 years of the government, which doubled housing costs, doubled food inflation, doubled food bank usage and increased crime by 55%, Canada is not Canada anymore. It certainly does not feel like it, because the government has done the most irresponsible thing with the safety of Canadians and their money.

The Prime Minister had the gall to stand up in front of young Canadians and tell them they would have to sacrifice more so he could spend more, and, boy, will he spend a lot of money. In fact, if the deficit is doubled, it can only be paid in a few ways. He will raise taxes again, or it will be paid through the silent tax, inflation, which will make sure that all the things Canadians buy will be more expensive afterward.

How much more do young Canadians have to sacrifice? Let us look at the affordability crisis the government has created.

Young Canadians who do the right thing, work hard, go through school and graduate cannot find a job, cannot move out of their parents' basement and certainly cannot afford anything. They cannot meet the milestones of their life that are so important and that we used to consider the Canadian dream, such as going to school, getting a good job, getting married, buying a home and having kids.

All of that is being sacrificed because the Prime Minister thinks it is more important that his banker buddies get paid more on the interest on the debt that the government has put on top of Canadians. In fact, it is so bad that his banker and bondholder buddies get more money than what goes to the provinces in health care trans-

fers. The money his banker buddies get is more than what Canada collects in GST revenues.

This budget has nothing to help Canadians who are fearing for their life these days. Violent crime is out of control. It is up 55%. Gun crime is up 130%. Extortion, which has really affected the South Asian community, is up 330%. The Liberals could not even say "extortion" in this budget.

- (1030)

Canadians will not feel any safer now. Whether they are sitting at home, sitting in their car or walking their kids to school, every Canadian is saying they are scared. Under the government, which has soft-on-crime policies, criminals have more rights than victims. The budget changes none of that.

The Prime Minister is notorious for breaking every single promise. He said he was the guy to deal with President Trump. In fact, his elbows went missing and Canada's tariffs went up. Every place that he or his Minister of Foreign Affairs goes, tariffs go up and Canada's ranking in the world gets lower. He went to China; the tariffs went up. He said he could deal with Trump; again, the tariffs doubled. If the Prime Minister really had his elbows up, Canada would have a better deal and a better standing in the world, but obviously we do not. He said he would spend less. In fact, he doubled the deficit and put more debt on Canadians' heads.

Every single broken promise is more expensive for Canadians, who are already struggling under the government. Young Canadians have lost the dream of home ownership. Yesterday there was another broken promise, and the Governor of the Bank of Canada proved it. The Liberal government continues to say we have the fastest-growing and strongest economy in the G7. I asked the Governor of the Bank of Canada what he thought about it. He said that, in fact, Canada does not have the fastest-growing economy in the G7; Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7, and our economy is collapsing. That is why we are seeing that Canada also has the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7.

Why is that? It is because the Liberal government, with its anti-development, anti-energy laws, drove \$600 billion of good Canadian investment to the United States. Under the current Prime Minister alone, \$60 billion of good Canadian investment in jobs, talent and machinery has gone to the United States. The Liberals do not want anything to be built here. The only thing they are building in this country is more bureaucracy. That is on the taxpayer's head.

The Budget

The Liberals need to get rid of these anti-energy laws that will not let anything get built. They have these so-called investments, but we are not seeing more investment coming into Canada from the private sector. It does not pay to invest here in Canada under the Liberal government. That is why pipelines are being built outside, and nothing is getting built here. That is why our unemployment rate is going up and youth have no hope that they are going to be able to find a job after they graduate.

What we need to do, and what the Leader of the Conservative Party will do when he becomes Prime Minister, is unleash our economy by getting rid of all the antidevelopment laws in Canada from the Liberal government. We will get rid of the industrial carbon tax, Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and the oil and gas cap so that our food prices come down. We will have good Canadian jobs, and Canadians will be able to get good paycheques once again in this country.

We will strengthen the justice system so that Canadians can feel safe again, by reversing the same laws that give repeat violent offenders bail. We will give them jail and not bail so that they stay where they belong, behind bars, and Canadians can feel safe once again.

We will give Canadians affordable housing once again. Let us remember that, under the Conservative government, it was half the cost for housing, and it was a lot cheaper to get food. One paycheque used to do. We will bring back that same Canada, where hard work will give a good paycheque, with low taxes, so Canadians can afford homes and food, and they will have hope. On top of that, Canadians will be able to live in a safe community once again.

With that, I move:

That the amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the words “the government’s budget statement” and substituting the following:

“since, instead of presenting an affordable budget so Canadians can have an affordable life, it presented a budget that fails to:

- a) consider that every dollar the Liberal Government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians in the form of higher taxes and inflation;
- b) bring down the deficit to the level Liberals promised in their last fiscal update, which promised \$42 billion last year;
- c) scrap hidden taxes on food, including the industrial carbon tax on farmers, the food packaging tax that adds billions in costs, and the fuel standard tax that adds 17 cents per litre to diesel and gasoline for farmers;
- d) end the inflation tax by bringing down the cost of government instead of printing money to pay Liberal bills; and
- e) include a plan for any oil and gas pipelines that would strengthen our nation’s economy and get our resources to market.”

• (1035)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The subamendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Mont-Saint-Bruno—L’Acadie.

[*Translation*]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L’Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague’s speech, and I have a question for him. Canada is a G7 country with an advanced economy. Canadians expect concrete solutions for the future. Our budget invests heavily in housing, infrastructure and innovation to

build a stronger, fairer and more resilient Canada. Unfortunately, the Conservative Party is opposed to these essential measures.

How can my colleague justify his position? He seems to want to go back to the Stone Age, but this country needs to move forward.

• (1040)

[*English*]

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I did not find any of that in the budget. In fact, what we see is what we saw in the last nine Liberal budgets. We see that housing would get more expensive and less would get built in Canada, as well as a higher deficit, which means Canadians will be paying more for Liberal incompetence. The Prime Minister’s banker buddies and bondholders would get more money than what goes to the provinces in health care transfers. Canadians will have to line up even more at food banks after this budget’s release.

What the Liberals needed to do was get government out of the way, cap government spending, get rid of the food taxes so that food inflation and food costs can come down and get rid of antidevelopment laws so that Canada can build, build, build.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that the budget is getting panned.

Here are just some headlines today on the budget: “Canadian aid cuts will bite deeply in global crisis zones, relief agencies say”; “Federal budget signals [the Prime Minister]’s new tone on climate policy, but not much substance”; “A ‘generational budget’ that does little but set federal spending adrift”, and that article, by the way, was written by the former associate deputy minister of Finance Canada; and another editorial headline, “The Liberals’ growing deficit of trust”.

I am going to replace the Prime Minister’s name with his title here: “Budget shows [the Prime Minister] doesn’t know how tough it is out there on Main Street”; “Great budget, [Prime Minister]. It would be a shame if Canadians don’t get outside”; and “After all the hype, [the Prime Minister’s] first budget fails to meet the moment”.

Those are out of just one publication, The Globe and Mail. Here is what the Toronto Star headline says: “Once again, [the Prime Minister] doesn’t quite live up to the hype”.

Would the member comment?

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague and friend for the tough but fair question, and he is absolutely right. The Prime Minister admits that he does not even do his own grocery shopping, so how would he know that his failed policies and all the advice that he gave to the previous prime minister, have made food inflation double what the bank's target rate is or that the Liberals' industrial carbon tax, oil and gas cap and food packaging tax have made food more expensive? How would he know, when he does not fill his own gas tank, that his industrial carbon tax or his clean fuel standard is raising the cost of the fuel that Canadians have to put in their tanks to get their kids to school and to get them to sports?

It is making life more expensive. We need to get rid of all these policies of Liberal incompetence so that Canadians can have an affordable and safe life once again.

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives pride themselves on being champions of fiscal restraint. I would like to remind my colleague that, under the Harper government in 2009, the deficit was \$55 billion. Taking that data and adjusting it for today's inflation puts us pretty much in the same ball park.

The Conservatives are saying that the deficit in this budget is too big and that they would have limited it to \$42 billion. What I see in this budget, which looks more like a Conservative budget, is record military spending, a massive tax cut and handouts to oil companies.

Do the Conservatives really oppose the deficit, or do they oppose it only because it is not their deficit?

[English]

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I am going to put this in terms of everyday Canadians. In fact, in the last Conservative government, food did not cost this much. Housing was half the cost. We did not have an inflationary crisis. It was former prime minister Stephen Harper in the last Conservative government who got us through a global financial crisis and made sure inflation did not go up. It is the incompetent Liberal government that has ended up spending more than any other government before it and has given Canadians an inflationary crisis, which has led to the most rapid interest rate hikes in Canadian history.

What do we see today? We see more Canadians lined up at food banks than ever before. There are 2.2 million Canadians, 700,000 of whom are children. Now mortgage delinquencies are going up because Canadians who are renewing their mortgage are seeing that their rates have almost doubled. This is because the government cannot control itself from spending Canadian taxpayers' money out of control.

[Translation]

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must inform you that I will be sharing my time with the member for Mississauga—Lakeshore.

Tuesday's budget is aimed at building a strong and prosperous Canada. Basically, it comes down to three pillars: build, protect and empower.

The Budget

Before I talk about the budget itself, I think it is very important to talk about the context this budget fits into. The reality is that the world changed a year ago in November 2024, when a new U.S. president was elected. That election triggered a reconfiguration of global trade. All the old rules governing trade between countries completely vanished overnight. This is making multilateral institutions weaker. Arbitrary, unfair, illegal tariffs are having a huge impact on the Canadian economy. They have reshaped supply chains, raising production costs and significantly slowing down economic growth in Canada and other parts of the world. In 2025, economic growth has slowed considerably around the globe, including in the United States.

Canada is being dealt a double blow. We are being hit by increased costs due to tariffs, and we are also starting to feel the impact of a slowdown in U.S. demand. Canadian exporters are really starting to suffer. However, the takeaway from yesterday's conversation with the Governor of the Bank of Canada in committee is that, domestically, the Canadian economy is still performing relatively well. We are seeing weakness in external sectors and international trade, that is, exports. As we all know, 80% of Canadian exports go to the United States.

What we are seeing here is not a normal economic cycle in which we can expect a downturn to be followed by a recovery. This is a major structural shock. As our Prime Minister has said several times, things will never be the same again. We must meet this moment. We must meet it vigorously, and we must meet it now—not three years from now, not five years from now; now. Now is the time to respond to this radical change. Now is the time to overcome that external weakness.

That is why we are doing exactly what we said we would do. We will make massive investments in our economy to support and facilitate this transformation. The time is now. That is what we are going to do, not just because it is the right thing to do, but because we have the means to do it.

There has been a lot of talk in the House about the \$78-billion deficit. Members are saying that it is an enormous deficit, the worst since the Stone Age or who knows when. These are gross exaggerations. We are talking about \$78 billion. When we talk about deficits, debts or many other economic and financial indicators, we always need to put them into perspective. We cannot talk about a \$78-billion deficit in the abstract. We always need to put it into perspective. In this case, we need to look at it in terms of the size of the economy. It is not 2010 or 2000 anymore. It is 2025. If we look at this supposedly enormous \$78-billion deficit in proportion to the size of the Canadian economy, we see that it amounts to just 2.5% of the GDP. Basically, it is one of the lowest deficits in the G7. We have the fiscal space to act, and we are acting forcefully and vigorously because massive intervention is required in the current circumstances.

The Budget

● (1045)

The public debt is 42% of the GDP. Yes, we are talking about billions and billions of dollars and all of that, but in proportion to the size of the economy, the debt is 42% of the GDP. Once again, this level of debt is much lower than average. It is even below the G7 average.

What is more, since our friends are so fond of making comparisons and sharing what other agencies and stakeholders are doing, I would refer them to the most recent Moody's report, which was issued on October 31, just before budget day. Perhaps they are familiar with Moody's, the rating agency. On October 31, Moody's reaffirmed Canada's AAA credit rating and said that Canada was still financially strong, one of the strongest countries in the world.

● (1050)

[English]

We are not the basket cases. Come on, guys, wake up.

An hon. member: There are 700,000 children at food banks.

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, we have one of the best credit ratings in the world.

[Translation]

We have the fiscal space to take action, and we are going to act within our means.

I would appreciate the opportunity to continue my speech. I did not interrupt my colleagues.

[English]

An hon. member: You should be ashamed.

Carlos Leitão: You should be ashamed. This is a democracy. We have to listen to each other.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order.

There has been enough back-and-forth from both sides. The House will come to order.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry has the floor.

[Translation]

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, I will continue my speech and remain calm.

What we also have in Canada is a productivity problem. This country has a productivity problem, and it started a long time ago. It is the outcome of insufficient private investment in machinery and equipment, and this is precisely what are going to tackle with this budget.

The budget contains very concrete, real measures to trigger a wave of productivity-boosting investments. In fact, the only way to make life more affordable for Canadians is not to lower prices, but to increase Canadians' incomes.

Do our friends opposite understand that falling prices are known as deflation? Are our friends aware that deflation usually triggers a

severe economic depression? That is no way to improve affordability. Increasing the incomes of Canadians is the way.

We need to boost productivity in order to increase Canadians' incomes. Canadians must have the tools they need to do their jobs more efficiently, which will help them earn higher wages. Our budget focuses on that, by triggering what we believe will be a wave of \$1 trillion in investments, which will lead to a significant increase in productivity.

We are going to invest in infrastructure, we are going to invest in housing and, of course, we are going to invest in business productivity. A number of measures will be introduced, but today I will give just one example: a superdeduction to really promote investment.

Since I am running out of time, I will wrap up by saying that we did the right thing and we did it at the right time.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague—a former Quebec finance minister, economist and former banker—on his speech.

The Liberal government's budget contains some creative accounting of Olympic proportions. It passes off expenditures as capital investments. Here is an example: Security for FIFA is considered a capital investment, not an expense. The budget contains other examples like that, and it will be really interesting to dig them all up.

Is my colleague opposite, who is an economist, a former finance minister and a banker, not embarrassed to have his name associated with a budget that contains such creative accounting, to put it politely?

● (1055)

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, members may have noticed that, in my speech, I talked about the total deficit of \$78 billion. I did not hide anything. The budget document itself does not hide anything either. Everything is clearly stated in it.

We state that we are going to invest heavily in housing, in productivity and in supporting Canadians. That is what we are going to do.

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his very eloquent speech. Members on the other side of the House often talk about young people, saying that times are tough for them. However, in this budget, the government is investing just over \$1 billion to make sure that young Canadians have opportunities.

Can my colleague elaborate a bit more on that?

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, with the budget, we will be investing significantly in the economy, with a particular focus on young people. We are well aware that young people are facing a challenging situation. If we want to help them, we need to give them opportunities. We need to ensure that the labour market functions better so that these opportunities become a real possibility. That is how we are going to move forward.

The Budget

One of the ways we are doing that is through the Canada summer jobs program. It is an extremely important program that supports young people who are still in school.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Drummond asked a former finance minister a very simple question, and I expect a very simple answer from that former finance minister.

How does he explain the fact that security spending for hosting FIFA is listed in the federal government's investment column of this budget, rather than in the expenditure column? I am going to focus on that specific example. Can my colleague explain to me how spending money on security for FIFA is an investment?

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, security is security. Whether it is security for FIFA or for anything else, it is national security. Again, I stated very clearly in my speech that the deficit was \$78 billion. We are not hiding that fact. Everything is there. All the details are there.

[English]

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my riding, of course, is very far away from Ottawa, and we rely heavily on the services the federal government provides locally to be able to do things such as file taxes and figure out eligibility for various government programs. This is a budget that is going to make major cuts.

I am wondering if the hon. member can share what services are going to be lost to the people in my riding.

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, it is a very relevant question. We are going to protect public services. We are going to make sure Canadians continue to have access to the services they need. In fact, in that context, I would mention one of the measures that was just announced, and that is the automatic federal benefits for low-income individuals, where the CRA will prefill tax reports so disadvantaged Canadians, who usually do not file tax reports, would have access to the programs they are entitled to.

Charles Sousa (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin for sharing his time.

I am proud to rise today in support of budget 2025. The budget would address the global challenges Canada is facing and seize the opportunity to reshape our economy and our nation's future.

I want to thank the many residents of Mississauga—Lakeshore who have spoken to me directly at town halls and constituency meetings to share their input on what they wanted to see in budget 2025. This budget reflects their priorities. It also speaks to the priorities and values of our new government: making the necessary investments to build, protect and empower Canada.

Canada stands at a moment of profound transformation. Global economic systems, trade routes and alliances are shifting faster than at any point in recent memory. This instability is creating challenges for workers, families and businesses, but it also offers opportunities for Canada to chart its own course.

Global trade disruptions, tariffs and slower growth are being felt across Canada. Families are struggling with higher costs, young people are finding it harder to start careers, and small businesses

are delaying plans because of unpredictability. However, the economy remains steady, with growth projected at just above 1% in 2025. This stability reflects Canadians' resilience and determination.

The government rejects the path of austerity and retreat. Instead of slashing programs and waiting for recovery through trickle-down economics, Canada will invest decisively in itself, strengthening national capacity, independence and opportunity.

Budget 2025 has been designed as a generational response to historic challenges. Canada enters this period from a position of fiscal strength, with the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and one of the smallest deficits in comparison. Debt is a function and it is relative to wealth. This stability proves there is room for bold, strategic investments. Over the next five years, public and private initiatives are expected to generate more than \$1 trillion in total investment.

The past year has shown that relying heavily on a single market or supplier leaves the country vulnerable. This budget commits to helping strategic sectors, including steel, aluminum, the automotive industry, forestry and agriculture, adapt and expand. A \$5-billion strategic response fund would help support companies in retooling, designing new products and accessing new markets. A \$1-billion liquidity package would support small and medium-sized businesses through uncertainty, and new retraining programs will prepare 50,000 workers for emerging industries.

To build our strength at home, we need to focus on who we buy from and who buys from us. Canada's trade diversification strategy aims to double overseas exports within a decade, unlocking \$300 billion in new opportunities, while a new buy Canadian policy would ensure that federal procurement prioritizes domestic suppliers.

From steel in Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie to aluminum in Saguenay and autos from factories throughout Ontario and across the country, we are creating good jobs in our communities and supporting Canadian industry in the face of illegal and unjust tariffs, building resilient domestic supply chains that Canadians can rely on. The buy Canadian policy is how we make sure that every public dollar we spend contributes to a stronger, more secure and more prosperous Canada for everyone. These initiatives will strengthen domestic capacity, ensuring that future economic shocks can be met with made-in-Canada solutions.

The Budget

Strong nations build strong foundations. Budget 2025 introduces the largest wave of infrastructure investment in decades. Projects would modernize highways, ports, airstrips and energy grids to connect regions and strengthen supply chains. A dedicated Arctic infrastructure fund and a build communities strong program would expand opportunity to northern and rural areas, creating high-paying jobs and new corridors for trade and travel.

For many Canadians, home ownership feels increasingly out of reach. Under the leadership of Ana Bailão, a good friend, Build Canada Homes would tackle this crisis, together with the government, by doubling the pace of construction over the next decade, leveraging Canadian-made materials, domestic skilled trades and strategic partnerships across the country.

● (1100)

To make daily life more affordable, the government has reduced personal income taxes for 22 million Canadians. The budget would make the national school food program permanent and ensure the automatic delivery of federal benefits to 5.5 million low-income households. Together, these measures would target the immediate cost of living pressures while larger investments take shape.

A confident, sovereign nation must be able to protect itself. Budget 2025 would commit \$30 billion over five years, the largest defence investment in decades, to modernize Canada's military, reinforce Arctic security and support NATO and NORAD commitments. These funds would expand the shipbuilding, aerospace and cybersecurity industries while creating domestic jobs in technology and advanced manufacturing. This budget would invest in both protection and prosperity, building Canadian capabilities that defend our national sovereignty and drive international growth.

Raising productivity is central to long-term prosperity. The budget responds with targeted measures to mobilize talent, ideas and investment. New incentives would encourage research and commercialization in clean technology, quantum computing and artificial intelligence. Expanded tax credits would reward business innovation and worker training, especially in high-demand sectors such as construction, advanced manufacturing and renewable energy. The government would work with unions and employers to help Canadians upgrade skills and transition into new, better-paying careers.

Major investment must be matched with fiscal discipline. The government would introduce a capital budgeting framework to clearly separate everyday operating expenses from long-term growth investments. This transparency would ensure that public dollars are used strategically to strengthen productivity and prosperity. We are committed to balancing the operating budget by the 2028-29 fiscal year, with a steadily declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. As someone who has tabled a balanced budget, I can say it is harder than it looks, but trust us when we say the Prime Minister is the only leader in this House who has the experience and ability to get us there.

This is not short-term. This goes beyond election cycles. Years ahead, many others will be doing the ribbon cutting for the initiatives taken by this government today.

Over five years, we would achieve \$60 billion in savings. We would protect vital social programs, like \$10-a-day child care, dental care and pharmacare and redirect resources away from duplication and inefficiency. This would mean smarter government, fewer overlaps, modernized service delivery and leaner operations. The result would be a smarter, leaner government that invests ambitiously, but spends responsibly. It is about investing and, at the same time, sustaining those important social programs that Canadians and our neighbours value.

Generational investment is not only about infrastructure; it is about people. The government would expand opportunities for Canadians to learn, work and succeed. Training and mobility programs would help young people and workers move into trades, clean energy and advanced manufacturing. Support for unions and apprenticeships would ensure that Canadians build the future with their own hands.

Economic transformation will depend on a workforce that is adaptable, skilled and secure. Budget 2025 would strengthen this foundation by aligning immigration policy, education and labour market strategies to fill shortages and open pathways for every generation. When Canadians have access to meaningful work, affordable housing and reliable public services, confidence grows. Prosperity is strongest when it is shared, and inclusivity remains at the heart of this government's approach.

Budget 2025 is rooted in confidence in Canada's people, resources and values. It acknowledges uncertainty, but refuses to be defined by it. The plan would position Canada to lead in energy, critical minerals, technology and innovation, while safeguarding the environment and social programs that define national identity. Canada's advantages are clear: abundant resources, world-class talent and stable democratic institutions.

Through targeted spending, disciplined fiscal management and deep collaboration with the provinces, indigenous communities and private partners, this government would transform resilience into growth. Every investment, from homes to highways and training to trade corridors, would serve one purpose: ensuring that Canadians shape their own destiny.

● (1105)

The choices made in 2025 will shape Canada's next generation. The government's path is one of investment and empowerment. We will continue to foster growth and support Canada and Canadians for a better future.

The Budget

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to know who the member got this speech from. It sounds like it was made 10 years ago by Justin Trudeau and his cabinet then. What has changed? Justin Trudeau took power over 10 years ago, and the Liberals have been in power for 10 years.

What has changed? The debt used to be \$600 billion. It is now close to \$1.3 trillion and will be \$1.6 trillion by 2030. That is what has changed. In B.C., we have lost 29 mills and thousands of jobs. Ultimately, the bill lands in the taxpayers' back pocket. The Liberals are maxing out their credit card and not getting many results.

My question is simple. When will the Liberal government finally start to understand and respect that it is spending taxpayer dollars? When is it going to start respecting—

• (1110)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Mississauga—Lakeshore has the floor.

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, the question is about debt and deficits. I understand them fully. I delivered six budgets in the past. I recognized, after the 2008 financial crisis, that we were at the lowest we could be across Canada, not just in Ontario. We invested in infrastructure to stimulate economic growth and we tackled the situation by growing and stimulating the economy.

Debt is a function of wealth. We could borrow to provide for investment and greater revenue in power, and that is what we did. It enabled us to have greater revenues and be able to come to balance.

This budget speaks about Canada and the opportunities afforded to Canadians for future benefit. The member opposite may know that his grandmother had a \$20,000 debt on a home worth only \$80,000. Today, an average home of about \$800,000 carries an approximate debt of \$100,000 to \$200,000.

It is the net benefit to Canadians that matters, and we are working for the benefit of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Mississauga—Lakeshore is being very inconsistent. Today he is saying that debt helps create wealth. When he was Ontario's finance minister, however, he said he was determined to balance the budgets to get the government's house in order. Today he is defending a budget that creates a deficit of \$78 billion, \$45 billion of which was artificially reclassified as investments to lower the deficit on paper.

Today the Liberal Party is saying that the world has changed. I would like my colleague to explain what has changed: his principles regarding fiscal discipline or the Liberal definition of transparency.

[*English*]

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, we recognize it very well. My colleague, the former minister of finance for Quebec, and I delivered around 11 budgets between us. One thing we did that is similar to what is in this budget was ensure that we distinguished between borrowing for operating and borrowing to make investments and increase our prosperity. We delved very precisely into infrastructure

spending programs, which subsequently enabled us to have a much greater level of prosperity and revenues. Even to this day, former governments are still doing ribbon cuttings for the things we approved, because our budgets went beyond election cycles and looked forward to the future of families and the future of Canada.

That is how we achieved balance.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is really encouraging that we have the amazing talents of those who sit around the Liberal caucus, including the former finance minister for the Province of Ontario and the former finance minister for the Province of Quebec, who has just spoken. Our Prime Minister was the governor of the Bank of Canada and the governor of the Bank of England. He is an economist. Understanding the economy is so critically important.

I am wondering if my colleague could provide his insights into why it is so important that we build Canada strong at this time.

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize that there are two ways to stimulate economic growth in this country. One way is monetary policy, which the opposition has determined should not even exist.

We need to have an independent and arm's-length overview of monetary policy to control inflation, and it has happened. Canadians had to endure some suffering, but the world suffers still to this day. The Bank of Canada took the necessary steps to control inflation, which has been a global phenomenon.

Here in the House, we have the opportunity to control what we can focus on, and that is fiscal policy. We are investing to stimulate growth. That is what this budget is all about.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my neighbour the MP for the soup and salad bowl of Canada.

Canadians elected the Prime Minister because they believed that, maybe, his experience meant steadiness in uncertain times. They believed that perhaps, finally, someone would treat the nation's finances with care.

This budget is a breach of that trust. It is a promise written with red ink in stone, a pledge of debt that my generation and my children's generation will be forced to honour long after the current Liberal government is gone. It doubles the deficit of the Trudeau years. It exceeds the red ink spilled during the global financial crisis and leaves Canadians with nothing resembling a plan for balanced growth. It is spending without restraint, strategy or an honest accounting of how the debt will ever be serviced.

The Budget

Both capital and operational spending, every dollar of it, must be paid for in one way or another. The budget abandons the fiscal anchor that guided us for decades, the debt-to-GDP ratio that still governs our allies and disciplines responsible nations, and then it dares to call itself generous, offering a tax break with one hand while burdening every Canadian with approximately \$2,000 more in debt with the other.

Over the next five years, our national debt will rise by \$324 billion. That is like handing every Canadian family a \$20,000 credit card bill and saying, "Good luck. You will pay for it." In other words, that is \$10 million of debt per hour, with every tick of the clock another \$10 million on the nation's credit card. Interest payments alone will climb from \$55 billion to \$76 billion, which is more than all the GST collected in this country.

As a finance professional, I am troubled by another deception. The government is playing with the very definitions of capital and operating budgets by shifting tax breaks and subsidies into the capital column to give the illusion of fiscal prudence. Right on page 283 of the budget, conveniently buried in the annexes, right at the back and only because the government was forced to disclose it, corporate income tax credits are treated as capital investments. It is confirmed that the government hands Canadian tax dollars to big corporations and calls it capital investment.

Does the U.K. or Singapore do this? Do Canada's provinces do it? No, but the Liberal government does, and then it tells Canadians that it is balancing the operating budget in three years and being fiscally prudent when it is simply moving big subsidies and tax breaks for private companies as capital investments. We also know that even security for FIFA is going to be a capital investment. It is not prudence; it is the manipulation of Canada's budget.

It is always risky for an entity to change its accounting metrics, let alone when reporting is delayed, deficits are ballooning and economic conditions are deteriorating. This change, which is solely for a politically expedient communication strategy, is damning. It is an unnecessary risk to Canada's credit rating and fiscal integrity in very uncertain times.

Canadians believed there was a steady hand on the wheel. This budget has no hand, no wheel and no map. It is impossibly vague. It gestures toward major projects without naming them and military spending without strategy. It is seven months after the election, and we still have no idea where the government is leading us. We only know that it plans to spend \$141 billion more, choosing the winners and losers instead of fixing fundamentals.

The budget should have unleashed domestic capital to keep investment here and not drive it away.

● (1115)

It should have addressed the weight of development charges and broken the bottlenecks in housing construction. Instead, the Building Industry and Land Development Association describes it as follows:

...Budget 2025's treatment of Development Charges...is particularly troubling. Not only has the federal government's language changed markedly, backing away from the commitment...[that] is now only a framework for federal, territorial, and provincial agreements, not an actionable plan to reduce municipal housing fees with any sense of urgency.

The Liberal government should have treated all Canadians fairly and extended the GST/HST exemption for all homebuyers. It should have kept its election promise to reduce municipal development charges by 50%.

It should have approved LNG pipelines to the east coast, freeing our allies from their dependence on Russian gas while building a bridge to renewable energy. It should have cleared the path for the mining of critical minerals in Ontario's ring of fire and the infrastructure to get them to market. It should have cut the red tape that strangles our entrepreneurs and lowered taxes so they can invest, expand and hire.

Instead, we have an \$80 billion deficit, \$16 billion higher than even the Prime Minister's own campaign pledge, with no road back to balance.

Behind every number is a human story. Food inflation is hitting hard. Right now, we have approximately 700,000 visits by children to food banks in a single month. That is a generation of children growing up watching their parents struggle because they cannot afford groceries because the government keeps spending beyond its means.

Private sector investment is collapsing. Since the Prime Minister took office, quarter after quarter, businesses have lost faith that the government understands how wealth is created. As confidence leaves, capital leaves with it.

One in three young Canadians are now thinking of leaving this country, not because they lack patriotism but because they no longer believe they can afford to stay. That is the tragedy of this budget.

To the government opposite I say this. It should come to its senses and return to the discipline that once made Canada a model of stability and sound management. It cannot spend its way to affordability. A government that cannot live within its means will never make life affordable for those who must live within theirs. Canadians did not elect it to max out the country's credit card.

I believe in a Canada where fiscal responsibility is not a slogan but a standard, where government acts with prudence and with purpose, and where every dollar is spent with the humility that it belongs first to the people who earned it. I believe in a Canada where our children inherit opportunity, not debt, and can look to the future and see prosperity, not hopelessness in mountains of debt. That is the Canada we must fight to restore today.

The Budget

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think people do not understand the significance of this budget. We have set aside a large envelope to defend Canada in this budget. We are a G7 country, and we need to protect Canada because the world is changing right now.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about our investments in defending Canada.

[*English*]

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, there are some good elements in the budget. Unfortunately, when it comes to defence we see a new bureaucracy being created. We see billions of dollars thrown at this program, but there is actually no strategy. There are no details in the budget as to where the money is going to go. That is a problem because what we see is bigger programs and more spending, but nothing is getting cut. That is why we see close to \$80 billion in deficit. The government cannot possibly be proud of that record.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is a question I like to ask the Conservatives. Oddly enough, I never get an answer from them, and that always surprises me. I will try my luck with a new colleague. Maybe I stand a better chance of getting an answer from her this time.

I asked my colleague from Richmond—Arthabaska the same question earlier. It was related to government waste and the deficits that the Liberals like to describe as generational. This budget extends tax credits for oil and gas companies until 2040. We already knew that the tax credits for oil and gas companies until 2035 would cost roughly \$83 billion. This extension will raise that total to over \$100 billion. The answer I got was it is important that we develop our natural resources. That is not what I am talking about.

I am wondering, do the Conservatives support giving \$100 billion in tax credits to an industry that clearly does not need tax credits?

• (1125)

[*English*]

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, we do believe in supporting the oil and gas sector and building pipelines because that is to Canada's competitive advantage. A country either has natural resources or does not. We have been blessed with the fact that we do. Unleashing our oil and gas sector will create jobs. It will create prosperity. That is income for families who desperately need it.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I asked one of the members earlier about service cuts to places like my riding, which is very, very far away from Ottawa and where we really rely on our services. He answered by saying that the CRA would improve efficiencies by pre-filling applications and tax filings for Canadians.

Given the extremely low accuracy of the CRA in answering questions, as I believe the CRA is answering questions accurately only about 17% of the time right now, I wonder if my colleague would comment on the service cuts to her riding and to Canadians.

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we have a problem with the CRA, a problem that has been growing over the last years and has not been addressed, unfortunately, by the government.

When we have the Canada Revenue Agency, the agency that collects the revenue for our country, not being able to perform, it is very serious, particularly when we talk about the fiscal position of our country. The agency is not able to provide answers accurately. Even its artificial intelligence chatbot is not able to provide correct answers. We saw most recently that there was fraud with an automatic filing where the CRA actually gave close to \$5 million in credit to a company that only generates \$250,000 in revenue. It does not make sense. That is a big risk.

We have to make sure we address the structural problems of the agency, so that it can finally be efficient.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, whatever it says on the front cover, this budget does not build a stronger Canada. It weakens it, piling up record debt, driving up costs and leaving working Canadians to carry the weight of the Prime Minister's spending and years of Liberal failures.

Canadians were told to expect something “generational”. They were promised a serious plan to restore discipline after a decade of Liberal overspending and inflationary deficits. Instead, they got a banker's budget, one that borrows more, taxes more and delivers less than ever before.

This plan is obsessed with the appearance of stability, but not the reality of affordability. Liberal ministers are celebrating empty promises and vague fiscal targets that exist only on paper. Meanwhile, Canadians are left holding a different kind of paper: real grocery receipts with fewer items and higher prices, and real bank statements that show savings shrinking month after month. I often say we cannot put a AAA credit rating on a hot dog, and we cannot buy dinner with a deficit projection either.

Behind all the rhetoric, the numbers tell the truth. This is the largest regular deficit in Canadian history, at \$78 billion, far above the \$62 billion the Prime Minister promised just months ago. The debt-to-GDP ratio is rising, not falling. Government spending is up \$90 billion over last year. That is \$5,400 in new spending for every household in the country.

The Budget

For all that spending, Canadians are not better off. They are falling further behind. Growth has slowed to 1.1%, the second-weakest in the G7. Unemployment will average 6.4% over the next five years. The gap between rich and poor has widened. Food bank lines are out of control, and 700,000 children have visited food banks. Investment is collapsing, housing starts are stalling and productivity is at its lowest point in decades.

This is not building Canada strong. It is building a weaker economy and a heavier burden for the next generation.

Clearly, this so-called new Liberal government and the banker Prime Minister have learned nothing from the past decade under Justin Trudeau. Higher spending is not progress. It is not strength. It is the reason families face higher prices, higher taxes and harder lives every day.

Case in point is the carbon tax. For years, the Conservatives warned that the consumer carbon tax punished families and drove up the cost of living. For years, the Liberals stood in this House and denied this, insisting it somehow made life more affordable. Now, in this very budget, the government brags about cancelling that tax. The Liberals call it divisive and boast that because they did so, gas prices are down and inflation has eased.

However, in the same plan, they double down on the industrial carbon tax. That tax drives up costs for farmers and home builders and pushes prices higher for everyone else. How much will it cost Canadians? How much misery will it inflict before they admit they were wrong again?

We cannot tax the things farmers need for growing food and not expect food prices to rise. We cannot tax the things home builders need for building homes and not expect home prices to climb. We have seen this pattern before: The Liberals finally admit there is a problem, but they turn around and repeat the same mistakes.

• (1130)

Here is another example. In the budget, they promised to provide more certainty to the marketplace, yet what they are doing for the Canadian auto sector is the very opposite. After years of threatening manufacturers with an electric vehicle sales mandate, they have now paused it. Let us kick the can down the road. Let us delay it. Let us review it. They still cannot say what comes next.

How can automakers plan for the future when Liberal policy changes every few months? The 2028 models are being finalized as we speak, decisions that shape jobs and investment for years to come. What are the workers at Honda Canada in Alliston supposed to think when the government keeps flirting with a policy that threatens their very livelihood, especially when the Liberals have failed to defend their industry against the Americans?

That is why the slogans in the budget ring hollow. The Liberal failures have driven jobs, investment and confidence straight out of the country. They shift opportunity abroad instead of creating it right here at home. If they truly wanted to build Canada strong, they would protect Canadian jobs and investment and give consumers a choice by scrapping the EV mandate for good, today.

The Prime Minister has spent months insisting that the budget is not spending; it is investing. We heard the same line from Justin

Trudeau for 10 years. Canadians know better. If this were true of the so-called investment, why stop at \$280 billion? Why not double it? Why not triple it? If the investment is so great, if every dollar returned more than it cost, there would be no reason to ever stop spending.

We have already seen the results of these so-called investments. Take Northvolt, the Quebec battery plant. The Liberals poured billions into it. The company went bankrupt, no batteries were built and taxpayers were left with nothing to show for it. Then there is Novavax and the \$130 million for a vaccine facility that never made a single vaccine. What about the Canada Infrastructure Bank? Since 2017, it has approved up to \$13.2 billion for 76 projects, yet only two have been completed. How much of the \$280 billion that the Liberal government is calling capital investments will yield similar results?

After 10 years, it has become apparent that what the Liberals call investment is what Canadians call waste. The evidence of that waste is not just failed projects; it is the results for ordinary people and the impact the waste has on their communities. After a decade of this so-called investment, our economy is weaker, productivity is falling and wages are stagnant.

Look at page 53 in the budget. The Liberals' own budget admits it. On page 53, they concede that if Canada's productivity growth had simply matched that of the U.S. since 2017, the median income of a family with one child would be nearly \$11,000 higher. That is the real return on Liberal investing: less growth, lower incomes and fewer opportunities for Canadians.

It is the same story that Canadians have seen for 10 years: a government that mistakes announcements for achievement and spending for progress. Canadians are working harder, paying more and getting less in return. They do not need a banker's budget that builds up the debt while they fall further behind. After all, Canada's strength has never come from government expenditures. It comes from the determination of Canadians: the family in Tottenham saving for their first home, the small business in East Gwillimbury growing and succeeding, and the farmer in the soup and salad bowl of Canada working 16 hours a days harvesting carrots to feed this nation.

The Budget

• (1135)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would challenge the member on how accurate a number of those statements are, but there is a substantial difference between the government and what we are witnessing across the way. We believe that investing in Canada is the way we are going to build a stronger and healthier country. By investing in Canada, we will have better roads, bridges and infrastructure that supports a healthier economy, and safer communities. This is what the Liberal Party, this government, is working towards: a stronger Canada. On the other hand, we see the Conservatives want to dispose of some of that infrastructure.

They are not voting for the budget. They are more interested in having an election than building a healthier Canada. Can the member explain why that is?

Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are concerned about affordability for Canadians. This is what this budget is all about.

We were told by the government in the last campaign that it was going to move at speeds Canadians had never seen before. This budget was going to be generational. We have the new Major Projects Office. The other day, I stood in the House and asked for the address, phone number and email. Well, it is not set up yet. Now we have the Build Canada Homes department, more bureaucracy. Where is the Build Canada Homes office? Well, that is not set up yet.

We have heard this song and dance before.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think you should give my colleague from New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury more time. It is always entertaining when he gives us his answers. I congratulate him on his speech.

Many people criticize the Liberal government's new budget for being very conservative. The budget contains a number of measures, and I would like to ask my colleague which of those measures he is happiest with. We will see if this really is a conservative budget. We will put that to the test.

The biggest line item is defence at \$56 billion. Tax cuts come to \$28 billion, and public service cuts total \$51 billion. There is no money for the environment, but there are billions of dollars in tax credits for oil companies.

Which of these conservative measures does my Conservative colleague like the most?

[*English*]

Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, one Conservative measure I can appreciate is the elimination of the carbon tax. We fought in the House for 10 years for the elimination of the carbon tax, and the other side, the government side, was fighting us every day on that. This is one Conservative measure I see in the budget that I am happy is gone thanks to Conservatives.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government often touts its record on net debt, but it fails to take into account that Canada is the smallest of the G7 economies. It has the smallest currency of the G7 economies, and it is not a reserve currency like the U.S. dollar or the euro. It also fails to take into account subnational debt in this country. It is among the highest levels in the OECD, which the federal government backstops. Just five years ago, a province hit the debt wall, ran out of money, could not pay its doctors and nurses and could not raise a penny on debt capital markets. The federal government had to bail it out.

Would the member comment on that?

Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, this is why we are standing here today. We are talking about \$80 billion. So that Canadians understand, just servicing that debt costs more than we spend on health care and unemployment insurance. We would need GST at 15% just to cover the interest on the debt. It is completely out of control.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I noted the hon. member's comments about poverty, and I wondered if he had seen the new report from the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development. There is no surprise if he has not, as it was just released this morning. It points out that Canada is off track in meeting its sustainable development goals to reduce poverty. The most recent numbers show that since 2020, although we had a drop in poverty during the COVID period, the poverty rate has been increasing, up from 6.4%. In 2023, it reached 10.2% and is rising.

I look for the member's comments.

Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, that is why I said that this budget should have been about affordability for Canadians.

Regarding the environment, the planting of two billion trees is now gone. It is another reversal, another broken promise. This budget should have been entitled "Broken Promises".

Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the residents of Nipissing—Timiskaming in support of the 2025 budget and our plan to build Canada strong and Nipissing—Timiskaming strong.

The budget is of critical importance to the 90,000 residents across the 35 communities that make up our riding. In the weeks leading up to the budget, I met with constituents to understand their situation. I also spoke with members of community organizations, such as the Rotary Club of North Bay, the Canadian Federation of University Women and the Temiskaming Municipal Services Association.

The Budget

Overall, I would say that my riding is not so different from others that I have heard about in this chamber. There are issues regarding housing and homelessness. Families are facing financial pressures. Tariffs are disrupting business supply chains, and municipalities are facing infrastructure gaps. At the same time, I found that people understood that Canada is facing economic challenges. While they would like things to be different, they understand that we need to redefine Canada's trade and security relationships.

I will be splitting my time with the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

Many constituents have also told me that they feel reassured to have a stable, calm and economically credible Prime Minister leading our country in these turbulent times. A resident pointed out to me that, at the recent United Nations meeting in New York, more than 700 requests for meetings with our Prime Minister poured in from foreign leaders, CEOs and business representatives from around the world. It was explained to me that this is a historic number of requests for a Canadian leader at such an event, which is a testament to the confidence that other countries have in Canada. Our Prime Minister explains it best when he says that Canada "has what the world wants".

As the member of Parliament for Nipissing—Timiskaming, I am proud to say that my riding also has many products and services that the world needs. Businesses in Nipissing—Timiskaming in sectors such as mining, forestry, aviation and aerospace, advanced manufacturing, and agriculture ship across Canada and around the world. That is why, in only the few days since the budget was presented, I have received calls from representatives from a few companies seeking information about the new productivity superdeduction. They quickly understood, and one replied, "This will help my business grow as I can now deduct significant capital investments." I know of other companies that have already taken advantage of the regional tariff response initiative delivered by FedNor, Export Development Canada's trade diversification program. There are company officials in the mining sector in my community who are looking at the \$2-billion sovereign fund for critical minerals and how this may tie into their business operations.

The budget contains many measures to stimulate business growth. It includes support for important economic development organizations, such as the Northern Ontario Farm Innovation Alliance. It also contains funds for Wood WORKS! and Innovation Initiatives Ontario North. I have encouraged all businesses and organizations in my riding to read the budget and to understand how it is positioning Canada, and this is very important as the most competitive jurisdiction in the world for new business investment. Therefore, I think everyone will agree that this budget would support investment and is progrowth.

However, ultimately, the budget is truly pro-Canadian and pro-Nipissing—Timiskaming residents. It is a budget that would encourage Canada's growth, yes, but in doing so, it would create well-paying jobs, reduce the cost of living and, most important, protect our Canadian way of life. Prior to the budget, at our constituency offices in Temiskaming Shores and North Bay, we received calls from residents who were concerned about cuts to the dental care program, which has become so essential to families in our riding. We received calls from seniors who were panicked about misinfor-

mation that was circulating about cuts to old age security benefits. Today, I am pleased to confirm to residents of Nipissing—Timiskaming that budget 2025 would protect the vital social programs that matter to the citizens of our riding, and I will name them.

● (1145)

They are the Canada child benefit, the national school food program, the Canada disability benefit, the old age security program, Canadian student loans and grants, \$10-a-day child care, the Canada workers benefit, the Canadian dental care plan and pharmacare.

It is difficult to summarize everything budget 2025 holds for the citizens of Nipissing—Timiskaming, but I would like to focus on a few points.

As a former mayor, I know there are significant infrastructure gaps that communities have simply not been able to tackle. For example, in my riding, the town of Powassan and the township of Nipissing have had to close a rural bridge they shared because it was simply too expensive to repair. Unfortunately, this had consequences for local farmers who have to take a roundabout route.

These municipalities will now be able to apply to the build communities strong fund. This \$115-billion fund over five years will work to meet the needs of communities in Nipissing—Timiskaming from up north in Englehart to Trout Creek in the south, to Temagami First Nation in the west and to the town of Mattawan the east, and every community in between.

Equally important to mention is that these public funds will come with a requirement to buy Canadian. Canada is moving from a best-efforts approach to a clear requirement to buy Canadian. This will apply to our two excellent district social services boards, which are striving to ensure that everyone has a roof over their head. I know they are already working on projects that will bring housing solutions for those who are homeless, those who are in need of supportive housing and those in need of affordable housing.

Nipissing—Timiskaming is also home to six first nation communities, and budget 2025 recognizes their acute needs for housing. They have worked with our government to ensure that the budget addresses urban and on-reserve indigenous housing. It is important to note that the \$25 billion the government has directed to housing is Canada's most confident housing plan since World War II. It is significant. The budget also continues to address things like Internet services in Marten River, Temagami, communities around Lake Nobsong and the Mattawa River.

• (1150)

[Translation]

I know that young people in my community are excited about the new youth climate corps and the Canada summer jobs program. Nipissing—Timiskaming has a large francophone population, so support for Radio-Canada is welcome.

I also want to highlight action on fraud through the national anti-fraud strategy. North Bay is home to the Canadian Anti-Fraud Centre, and we welcome this attention to protecting people from fraud.

I should also mention the organizations that work so hard in our riding to promote our environment, such as the Canadian Ecological Centre.

[English]

I would like to conclude by touching on a final area of the budget that is important to my riding and that is defence.

North Bay likes to boast that no other community in Canada loves its military as much as its residents do. Since 1951, it has been home to the Royal Canadian Air Force and has protected North America's air sovereignty. With a junior A hockey team called the North Bay Battalion and a mascot named Sarge, North Bay understands the importance of Canada's significant investments in personnel, equipment, training and infrastructure to ensure that the Canadian Armed Forces can protect our country.

There is much more I could say about budget 2025. I will simply say I am proud to support a budget that invests in the residents, organizations and communities of Nipissing—Timiskaming and ensures a prosperous future for the children of the riding of Nipissing—Timiskaming.

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, ultimately, we know the emissions cap is a production cap. On page 108 of the budget, it says, “Effective carbon markets, enhanced oil and gas methane regulations, and the deployment at scale of technologies such as carbon capture and storage would create the circumstances whereby the oil and gas emissions cap would no longer be required as it would have marginal value in reducing emissions.”

Does this mean that the government plans to make the production of energy in our country minimal since the cap will be marginal in emissions?

Pauline Rochefort: Mr. Speaker, my colleague asks a very good question, but I would like to reply with the many good things that our budget includes and focus on the real relief it would bring to Canadians.

The Budget

I would like to speak about personal support workers in my community. It is an excellent example of how this budget is different and why it is important to Canadians. For example, I have a 95-year-old father, and personal support workers are very important in his life and the life of my family. We were absolutely delighted when the government came forward with the first-ever pension plan and tax deduction in support of personal support workers.

In fact, in my community lives the chief union steward for the Service Employees International Union, representing nearly 60 personal support workers in Nipissing. She said that they are delighted with these important initiatives and investments, and that this is how to invest in Canada and support Canadians.

• (1155)

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. To hear her talk, unicorns are descending on Ottawa, and this budget will solve all of our problems.

What I particularly liked about my colleague's speech was that she really highlighted who this budget is intended to help, namely the economic elite, the Prime Minister's friends. In her speech, she talked about numerous meetings. The people the Prime Minister wants to help are his friends, his buddies, the bankers and multinationals who are already filthy rich, not the real people who need money—seniors, young families and people who struggle daily to pay their bills, buy groceries and clothes and secure housing. She was clear about that.

Now she is telling us that this budget will take care of everyone, but the fact is that it will take care of the oil and gas companies by offering them \$100 billion in tax credits until 2040. Will that meet her constituents' needs? I very much doubt it. This former mayor also talked about infrastructure. Investing \$9 billion in infrastructure is peanuts. It is a drop in the bucket. She will never convince me that this is going to solve Canada's infrastructure problems.

I would like my colleague to explain to me how, given what I just said, she thinks this budget will really help the people who are struggling in her riding.

Pauline Rochefort: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleague about the Union culturelle des Franco-Ontariennes, a group of women who are actively involved in the communities of New Liskeard, Earlton and Belle Vallée in my riding.

They sent me a petition signed by nearly 100 people. What is important for them is that the budget does not make any cuts to the program offered by the Department for Women and Gender Equality. This is an example of how our government listens and responds to needs.

Today, I am pleased to be able to say that the government is listening and that the budget confirms \$600 million over five years to ensure services for women in our country.

The Budget

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to tell me what the government is doing in its 2025 budget for language minorities, such as francophones outside Quebec.

Pauline Rochefort: Mr. Speaker, I am proud to live in a community in northeastern Ontario where nearly one-third of the population is francophone or speaks French.

Federal government support is very important for us. It greatly improves things for minority communities outside Quebec. The federal government plays a key role, and this budget ensures important services for our community.

I mentioned services that are offered by Radio-Canada. Our community's cultural life is important. That is just one example of what our government is doing for the French-speaking population outside Quebec.

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to budget 2025, which was tabled by the Minister of Finance and National Revenue this week. My goal is to make my constituents aware of the benefits of this budget for the people of the Lower Laurentians and Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

This budget is a vision for a strong, responsible and ambitious Canada, a Canada that continues to invest in people while carefully managing public finances. We chose Canada. We want to invest in our country. That is our future. We want to build Canada strong.

We are in a period of global economic, social and technological transition. Canada and Quebec in particular must seize this moment to position themselves among the leaders of tomorrow. Budget 2025 offers them a smart way to do so. It invests more, but it spends more wisely. It is focused on what delivers real results: health, families, youth, seniors, businesses and local communities.

It does so without cutting programs that make a difference. All of our major federal programs have been maintained, which is important. All social programs have been maintained; they continue to help people, and many have even been improved. This budget is about progress, stability and confidence building.

If there is one measure that perfectly illustrates the philosophy behind this budget, it is the Canadian dental care plan. This program is transforming the lives of thousands of families across the country, including in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles. The riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles includes the municipalities of Deux-Montagnes, Saint-Eustache, Boisbriand and Rosemère in the suburbs north of Montreal. This budget is all about giving people back their dignity, their health and their smiles. This program is an investment in public health and social justice. It will help keep people out of emergency rooms, prevent complications and improve people's quality of life. I have said it before and will say it again: this budget does not cut any programs. On the contrary, it maintains and strengthens all the programs that support families, seniors and youth. This is proof that it is possible to invest and manage responsibly at the same time.

This budget provides concrete support to those who keep our health care system running. The new tax credit for personal support workers recognizes the essential contribution made by frontline

workers. These are the folks who take care of our parents, our neighbours and our most vulnerable loved ones. Often working behind the scenes, they do exceptional work. I really admire these individuals. If it were not for them, I would not be here today. It is very important to emphasize that frontline workers are helping our seniors.

In Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, this support will directly benefit the long-term care facilities, or CHSLDs, as well as seniors' homes and home care organizations. They deserve more than just our gratitude. They deserve meaningful support. This budget gives them that.

In my riding, seniors play a central role. They are the backbone of our families, our institutions and our values. The New Horizons for Seniors program, which was renewed in this budget, is a good example of that. It funds local projects that have a direct impact on the well-being of our seniors. This program is being carried out in every single riding. In Deux-Montagnes, in my riding, the program helped renovate the roof of the Heritage Club, a community centre for seniors. The program also helped support and renovate the Lions Club, which also supports our community. These projects tell the stories of the people and the places where they gather, where they can break their isolation and stay active in community life. It strengthens the heart of our communities. It is part of our social fabric. In this budget, seniors are at the core of our vision for an inclusive and compassionate Canada.

● (1200)

While we recognize the contribution of seniors, we are also thinking about the next generation. Budget 2025 strengthens the Canada summer jobs program, a program that I am very familiar with and that is making a real difference in our communities. With nearly \$600 million over two years, this program will create 100,000 summer jobs in 2026. For our young people, this is their first work experience, a source of pride and a gateway to the job market. In Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, young people are working for day camps, community organizations, small businesses and municipalities. This program is a game changer for families, because when there are affordable day camps that reduce costs, families can send their children there and continue to focus on their work. By giving our young people opportunities, we are building a stronger economy and a more confident country.

The Budget

I also want to highlight the measures in the budget that support our entrepreneurs and SMEs. Before becoming an MP, I was an entrepreneur. I also had the honour of serving as the president of the Regroupement des gens d'affaires de Boisbriand. I am well aware that SMEs are the backbone of our economy. I also know how important it is to buy local. The renewed commitment to our buy Canadian policy is great news. Every time the federal government makes an investment, Canadian workers and Canadian businesses should be the first to benefit. Buying Canadian promotes our expertise, maintains our jobs and encourages regional economic growth. Entrepreneurs at industrial parks in Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Boisbriand, Saint-Eustache and Deux-Montagnes are innovating every day. They are creating jobs, training apprentices, exporting their products and bolstering our collective pride. This budget sends them a clear message: The government believes in them.

Quebec is also an engine for innovation and for the future. Quebec has secured a win in this budget. Investments in artificial intelligence and in the aeronautics and aerospace industries will strengthen our leadership on the global stage. We have a huge number of great businesses in the aerospace sector in the Lower Laurentians, including L3Harris, Airbus, Bell Textron, and Safran. We also have great businesses in the transportation sector, including Nova Bus, which is building electric buses, and Paccar, which is building electric trucks. Sustained support is crucial to drive these businesses toward continued growth. I am also thinking of Kinova, a Boisbriand business that designs robotic solutions for the medical and mobility sectors. Kinova exemplifies the story of Quebec's talent in Boisbriand; it is a story of innovation and perseverance. Actually, I would like to take this opportunity to salute the people who work at Kinova. The measures in this budget will help businesses like Kinova continue to expand, create quality jobs, and showcase our skills around the world. These investments affirm Quebec's position as an economic partner and a driving force for Canada's transformation.

The budget also focuses on sustainable mobility and modern infrastructure. The high-speed rail project between Quebec City and Toronto will go through the north shore of Montreal and probably through Laval. This is a very exciting project and it will lower greenhouse gas emissions. One can envision the volume of vehicles travelling between the two cities that pass through Montreal. It is a great project, and it is now at the design stage. It is a visionary project that combines economic development and environmental responsibility.

I would also like to commend the government for its commitment to protecting the francophonie and linguistic minorities. French is not just a language. It is a culture, a way of looking at the world, and a common bond between communities. Budget 2025 has confirmed investments in culture and French-language media, including Radio-Canada. Preserving and promoting the French language also means standing up for our identity and our diversity. It also means doing more to preserve history across generations.

In conclusion, budget 2025 is a confidence-building budget. It supports families, workers, young people, and seniors. It promotes innovation, training, and job creation. It supports entrepreneurs and communities. We are choosing Canada. We are investing in our

country. This is about our future. Let us build Canada strong together.

• (1205)

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a fairly specific question.

I represent a riding where many people fish for a living, and I am the Bloc's fisheries critic. One of the big surprises in this budget is that there is nothing to renew the fisheries fund.

The fisheries fund is approximately \$40 million. The Government of Quebec provides 30% of that, while the Government of Canada provides 70%. This fund encourages innovation. It pays for scientific projects. Ultimately, it allows the fishing industry to modernize and to be more productive and grounded in science.

There is nothing in the budget about this fund. Why is that?

Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer the member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj's question. In the spring, the Liberal Party won 44 out of 78 seats in Quebec, its best showing in that province since 1980.

The member should know that the budget provides for a very important renovation. Money will be invested in the Magdalen Islands airport. I would hope that the member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj will support our 2025 budget.

[English]

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Quebec for bringing up the fisheries.

A lot of my constituents have been reaching out since the budget was released, specifically with respect to the Atlantic fisheries fund. I am wondering if my colleague across the way could speak to it and to whether or not it is something that would continue. It is very important to Newfoundland and Labrador.

• (1210)

[Translation]

Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives never miss an opportunity to talk down the Canadian economy and Canadian workers. Budget 2025 reflects Canada's strengths and ambitions.

I would like to know whether the members opposite will support our budget.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague has made reference to, there is so much within the budget to support our seniors.

I was really pleased to hear the degree to which the member advocates consistently, whether on women's issues or for seniors. She is very much a powerful advocate, let there be no doubt.

I was hoping the member would provide some additional comments as to why it is so important that government be there to support our seniors, young people and women in Canada. Could she add some value to that?

The Budget

[Translation]

Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, our budget addresses a number of realities, including the French language, youth and seniors. It also addresses the importance of ensuring that women can access the measures designed for them and of ensuring gender equality. Our budget includes funding to support frontline organizations working to combat gender-based violence. Money will be available. The budget includes \$660 million over five years, and all the groups that represent and support women were thrilled with that announcement.

I am also delighted to know that the New Horizons for Seniors program will be maintained, because it is having a tremendously positive impact in our communities.

The Canada summer jobs program is a resource for young people. It helps them find that first job and get work experience.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, earlier, my colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj asked my colleague from Rivière-des-Mille-Îles a very respectful question. He spoke to her about the fisheries fund, which is an issue of great concern to the people of Gaspé and the Magdalen Islands. He asked her why the fisheries fund was not included in the budget, given how important it is to the industry.

My colleague across the way responded somewhat aggressively, referring to the spring election that brought 44 Liberal members to power in Quebec, and she saw fit to respond with something about the airport in the Magdalen Islands.

My colleague's question was about the fisheries fund. Why is it not included in the budget? Can my colleague give a respectful answer to a respectful question?

Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, the fisheries are very important.

I am fortunate to sit on the Standing Committee on International Trade, and we are actively seeking new markets to export lobster and all our fish products. This issue is certainly being considered, and I thank my colleague for raising it. We are doing everything we can to open up our markets so that we are less vulnerable to the economy south of the border.

[English]

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Long Range Mountains.

Everyone is depressed. Why? It is because everyone is broke. We are more broke than we think. Do others remember the old Scotia-bank commercial, "You're richer than you think"? We are Canadians in the 11th year of a Liberal government who are more broke than we think. Two days ago, the government tabled a 400-page budget with a \$78-billion deficit. The Prime Minister, who lectures us about economics and caused record inflation in England, is now going to repeat the same in Canada by spending more money that we do not have.

What happened to our country? There are more than two million people visiting a food bank, more than 700,000 of them children. There are 700,000 Canadian children who are starving, and the Prime Minister and the finance minister are pretending everything is fine. I have spoken to hundreds, maybe thousands of people. No

matter where they are on the economic ladder, everyone is worse off, worse than they were six months ago, five years ago and definitely 10 years ago.

The Liberals sit here in question period and pretend that criticizing our economy is unpatriotic. It is the opposite. Standing up for our country when it is in trouble is the most patriotic thing one could do. I will do that because I remember what it was like a decade ago. In 2014, The New York Times came out with a study, which found that Canada's middle class was better than its U.S. counterpart. Ten years ago, Canada had the wealthiest middle class in the world. That is what I remember. When Conservatives were in government, we had more money in our pocket and more ability to put our kid in hockey or music lessons. We had the ability to travel and to go out for dinner with our loved ones. We slept better at night because we had money.

Then came Justin Trudeau, who promised to invest more. He said we needed an economy that worked for everyone and that to do this, he would run a few small deficits. Now, a decade later, we are broke. Now the current Prime Minister and the same old Liberal government are promising to do the same. When the Liberals say they will invest more, what they really mean is they will spend more.

As I was sitting here two days ago, the page handed me the budget book, and I opened it. I do not care what the finance minister has to say, because I could not believe my eyes. There is a \$78-billion deficit. To put that into perspective, that is \$5,400 for every Canadian family. Just like that, they will owe \$5,400 more to the banks and the bondholders, or he will print it on them, flooding the economy with more money to chase nearly the same amount of goods because we do not have any growth. That will raise, or inflate, the price of everything we buy.

Can members believe that we have \$55 billion in interest payments alone next year? That is more than \$1 billion a week in interest. That is more than the federal government collects in GST from all Canadians. Let us think about that. The next time we see the GST on our receipt, or the HST, which lumps in the GST, all of it goes to service the interest on our debt. At the end of the year, our debt will be \$1,347,000,000,000. Over the next five years, the Liberal government is projecting to add another \$320 billion in debt. Over the next five years, Canada will pay close to \$330 billion in interest alone to foreigners, to banks and to the Prime Minister's cronies.

The Budget

To be clear, government has no money. It is our money. It either takes it from us in taxes or it prints it. Canadians are some of the highest-taxed people in the world already. An average Canadian family spends over 42% of its income on tax, on income tax, payroll tax, sales tax, fuel tax, alcohol tax. Everywhere there is a tax. What do we have to show for it? Do we have good health care? Do we have good infrastructure? No. We have a Prime Minister whose deficit is double that of Justin's. Justin is out there partying with Katy Perry, but we are all screwed.

We should be the wealthiest country in the world because we are blessed with the greatest natural resources in the world. We have some of the world's highest-proven oil reserves and natural gas, which could satisfy the insatiable demand the world is experiencing for electricity. We have the rare earth minerals everyone is chasing.

• (1215)

We should be living like Saudi princes. We should be like the Qataris. There are 400 pages in this budget, but surprise, there is no pipeline. We are shooting ourselves in the foot. Why do we not just get out of our own way? Why does the government not get out of our way and allow us to drill for energy, export natural gas and use this blessing of our natural resources to put more money in Canadians' pockets?

We are actually importing oil from Russia. Members should think about how crazy that is. Other petroleum producers will not stop, but they pollute the environment. Canada has some of the best environmental practices in the world. Those who are passionate about the environment should want more Canadian oil instead of dirty oil from the Middle East.

To free Canada's natural resources and Canada's oil and gas would mean a richer middle class. It would mean less people at the food bank and a better life. We need to lower taxes for real. The finance minister grandstands every day and yells at us about how he is making life more affordable for 22 million Canadians. The Liberals' income tax cut works out to \$20 a month per family. An average family gets \$280 a year; that is it.

I could never imagine a budget that spends so much and does so little. What is the government building? It is building a couple of thousand shoeboxes for apartments, which comes to \$3 million per apartment when we factor in the cost of the bureaucracy.

The government is trying to fool us by separating the deficit into two. The Prime Minister is telling us that the actual deficit is not \$78 billion, no, because \$40 billion of it is capital investment, so the deficit is only \$38 billion. The Prime Minister is living by his own accounting rules: Abracadabra, the deficit is not \$78 billion; it is \$38 billion. I say shame on the Liberals for the budget and for making Canadians broke.

I was at the grocery store not too long ago, and there was a very kind lady in front of me. She had a small basket of groceries, among which was an English cucumber. I love cucumber. She asked the lady at the cash register how much the English cucumber would cost. The lady at the cash register told her the price, and the shopper said that she would not need it and returned it. The sales clerk politely smiled at her. I can imagine how many times a day this person sees this, when Canadians come from the grocery aisle

to check out, but they have to leave items behind because they cannot afford them.

How dare the government members be proud of the budget? With the endless taxes and inflation, they are making Canadians broke. I say shame on them.

• (1220)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the far-right member spoke about Canada's middle class and compared it to when Stephen Harper was in power. I just did a quick Google search. Interestingly, I found a story that says, "For decades, the United States boasted the honor of having the richest middle-class. However, since 2019, Canada has the wealthiest middle class of any country in the world."

The member talks about the deficit. Back in 2009 and 2010, which is when his leader sat in government, in a real dollars sense, the Conservatives actually had a higher deficit than the current budget being proposed. Does the member think the leader of the Conservative Party was irresponsible back then for putting such a deficit on Canadians?

Roman Baber: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the member is saying. In 2008 and 2009, we had a global financial crisis that the former Conservative government handled with flying colours. That is what happened in 2008 and 2009. Just 10 years ago, Canada had the wealthiest middle class. This is according to *The New York Times*.

Ten years ago the Liberals came into power, and now we have two million people at food banks and 700,000 of them are children. Shame on you.

The Deputy Speaker: I want to remind members that we speak through the Chair, not at the Chair. However, I will take the admonition in stride.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Drummond.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure you want even the insults to go through the Chair. It would be nice if people could show a little restraint.

I listened with interest to my Conservative colleague's speech. He said something that brought a question to mind. He said we import oil from Russia. I am not sure whether that is true.

I know that there has been a ban on Russian oil imports since 2022 and that we have not imported any since 2019. If it is true that we are still importing petroleum products from Russia, then I would like my colleague to back up that statement with some figures.

What exactly are we importing from Russia? That is illegal in Canada.

*The Budget**[English]*

Roman Baber: Mr. Speaker, last year, we imported oil from Russia. We are importing oil from Kazakhstan and Venezuela. We have some of the highest proven oil reserves in the world. We should be the wealthiest country in the world instead of relying on other countries for energy.

- (1225)

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his passion; it resonates with me.

When the government responds on affordability with the programs it is offering, what is the reality of that in terms of the member's constituents and the impacts of these programs?

Roman Baber: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Liberals are trying to address problems they created, but they never address the actual problem. Instead, all they do with their proposed programs is create more bureaucracy.

We can think about what they have done to date. They proposed to build more homes, but instead of doing that out of the Ministry of Housing, they created a new agency, Build Canada Homes. They proposed to build more projects; they talk about four pre-existing projects out of the first five, and, instead of running them out of the PMO, they built a new agency called the Major Projects Office. They talked about helping Canadians with defence procurement, and, instead of doing that out of the Department of Defence, they created a new agency for defence procurement led by someone who has no military experience whatsoever. This is lunacy.

We need to give Canadians more of their money back instead of building bureaucracies.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member was duly elected to the provincial legislative assembly, but this party, federally, does not reflect progressive values.

Premier Ford, at that time, called the member's comments "irresponsible". He said, "By spreading misinformation he is undermining the tireless efforts of our frontline health-care workers at this critical time". Premier Ford also said, "I will not jeopardize a single Ontarian's life by ignoring public health advice."

I agree that taxpayers work hard, and the member has put his name on ballots multiple times and is funded by the public purse. I ask the member, based on his comments today about the public purse, does he not have regard for the fact that he is employed by the public purse and the government has—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member to give a chance for the member for York Centre to respond.

Roman Baber: Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my political career. I am proud of my career in the provincial legislature of Ontario. I am proud for standing up for millions of Canadians who did not have a voice, and I am proud of the Leader of the Opposition for welcoming me into this party and Parliament and also of the people of York Centre for bringing me back to represent them.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Liberals released their 10th budget, with the costliest deficit outside COVID and double what the previous Liberal government left behind.

Canadians are paying more and are getting less. This budget drives up the cost of living for every Canadian on food, on homes and on everything that families buy.

For people back home in Newfoundland and Labrador, the cost feels heavier than ever. We face the highest unemployment in the country and the fastest net out-migration rate relative to our population. We have the oldest demographic and some of the highest food prices in Canada. When Ottawa overspends, we feel it. Our premier said yesterday, "[The] federal budget...raises far more questions than answers when it comes to whether or not it will benefit Newfoundlanders and Labradorians." I could not agree more.

The Prime Minister broke every promise he made just months ago. He promised a \$62-billion deficit but delivered a \$78-billion deficit instead. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, yet he raised it. He promised to spend less but is spending \$90 billion more. To put it into perspective, that is \$5,400 in inflationary spending for every household. He promised more investment, yet his own budget shows it is collapsing quarter after quarter.

The budget and the government are especially ignoring the realities faced by rural Canadians. As a member of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, I hear directly from the people being left behind. The committee heard testimony today regarding the EV mandates, from a business owner and employer living in a rural community. His message could not have been clearer.

The witness warned, "If you continue down this road, you will harm and destroy the auto industry and ruin the lives of a whole lot of people in rural towns all across the country. My store won't be profitable enough to survive if these mandates are enforced. 'A family business put out of business after 45 years by the government' will be the headline." Despite these warnings, the government will not commit to removing the mandates, which do not work for rural Canada. They could have been removed in this budget, but they were not.

The Budget

In regions where winter temperatures plunge, distances are vast and charging stations are few and far between, keeping these mandates only makes life more expensive. From transportation to groceries and home heating, costs are climbing, and it is everyday Canadians who are paying the price for the out-of-touch government. People are trying to make ends meet; they work and pay their taxes but still come up short because Ottawa keeps spending more but delivering less.

Families in Port aux Basques, Stephenville and Deer Lake are working hard. They are doing everything right, yet they are falling further behind. One senior from Brig Bay told my office that every month the decisions get harder: eat or heat, and buy groceries or pay the power bill.

Greta Gillingham from Trout River told me her survivor's allowance was cut by almost \$300 a month, leaving her struggling to pay for the basics while the cost of everything continues to rise. Catherine Alexander from Stephenville Crossing said she now buys only what is on sale and grows her own vegetables to offset grocery costs. She told me she does not buy fruit at full price anymore and cannot go out to eat because she simply cannot afford to.

These are not isolated stories; they are a mirror of what is happening right across Canada. Nationally, food bank use has doubled since 2019. That should be shocking to every member of the House. Recently, a report from my province told this story clearly. Food bank volunteers say families who used to come once a month now come every two weeks, and many parents are deliberately skipping meals so their children can eat.

The Single Parent Association of Newfoundland and Labrador shared one case where a mother was so hungry she ate food cold in her car because it was the only meal she had that day. Food First NL says 40% of children in Newfoundland and Labrador now live in food-insecure households. That is one of the highest rates in the country.

When parents are going hungry so kids can eat, it is not economic progress; it is a sign of a government that has lost touch with reality.

• (1230)

These are hard-working people who want a government that understands what life costs in Newfoundland and Labrador; a government that knows that one cannot fight inflation by spending more; a government that realizes that when the cost of fuel rises, the cost of everything else rises; and a government that realizes that baked-in, hidden food taxes raise the price of food.

In our province, many of our goods and services are shipped to us. Shipping costs, fuel surcharges and inflation pile one on top of the other. That is why food prices in Newfoundland and Labrador are among the highest in the country, and that is why families are cutting back on essentials.

While families are paying more, this budget makes life even more expensive. In a province already struggling with out-migration, it makes it harder for young people to stay and build their future at home. We are losing far too many of our young people to the mainland because they cannot make it at home. If a paycheque can-

not cover food, fuel and rent, families end up leaving the place they love.

Ernest Snooks returned to the province in 2015 from Alberta, and his goal was to build a future in Newfoundland and Labrador. He returned to school, and he did everything right to get ahead, but he is barely getting by. The cost of everything keeps going higher and higher. His everyday bills are piling up, and he is worried about his health because healthy food is priced out of his budget.

Every dollar the government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. Statistics Canada confirmed again this month that food inflation is still rising. According to the food professor, Canada is the only G7 country where food inflation has risen for four months in a row. Between March and September 2025, strawberries went up 25%; beef, 25% and coffee, 20%. Families are paying more for every staple.

Conservatives brought forward a plan to bring food costs down, end the food packaging tax, remove the clean fuel regulation that adds 17¢ a litre to gas and diesel, and stop inflationary deficits, but Liberals voted it down. Only Conservatives will stop the hidden taxes on food and restore common sense to affordability.

Conservatives want an affordable budget for an affordable life. On behalf of the Canadians whom the Liberals have priced out of food, homes and hope, we oppose this costly deficit budget that gambles away Canada's future.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business called this budget "a missed opportunity to provide meaningful tax relief". The Large Urban Centre Alliance said that it "relies on backward-looking data" that hides the housing crisis. Economist Mike Moffatt said he had "inadequately prepared [himself] for how disappointed [he] would be."

Even the people who wanted to believe in the government's promises are losing faith.

Wherever Newfoundlanders and Labradorians go, whether it is Alberta, Ontario or anywhere in between, we always find a way to gather together, to share stories and to stay connected, because we have a pride of place and a love that never leaves us. They ask for very little: only a fair shot at building a life where they were born. They deserve a government that recognizes their struggle and respects their effort. They deserve a budget that makes it possible to stay, raise their children and hope again.

The Budget

When a government spends recklessly and drives up inflation, it is rural Canadians who pay the price the worst, and when the same government turns a blind eye to the cost of living in places like mine, it risks losing the very communities that built this country. It is not compassion to spend what we do not have and leave the bill to those who can least afford it. It is not fairness when rural families pay more simply for wanting to live where they were born.

We call on the Prime Minister to work with us to build a positive, hopeful and affordable future, one where families in the Long Range Mountains can look at their grocery bill, their oil delivery and their tax statement and say that they can breathe easier, they can stay and they can build in Newfoundland and Labrador.

• (1235)

Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House, we hear a lot of negativity. On this side of House, we hear a lot of positivity. We often hear from the other side of the House about taking money out of people's pockets, when on this side of the House, we are about leaving money in people's pockets.

Pharmacare is still in the budget. Dental care is in the budget. The school food program is still in the budget. The child benefit is still in the budget. A tax cut for 22 million Canadians is still in the budget. I want to ask the member opposite if she supports those programs, because they leave money in the pockets of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Carol Anstey: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer my hon. colleague's question. Specifically, I will give a real-life example with respect to the government's idea about investment and programs. I reached out to all the schools in my riding about the school food program. Very few of the schools know anything about it, and very few are getting any benefit from it.

I will also point to an investment the Liberals made in a milk processing plant in my home community. They announced it in 2021 and again in 2022, but it never ever came to fruition.

I would love to have all this hope for the future, but the Liberals' solutions do not work.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on a subject that I think we are both concerned about, and that is the government's failure to renew the fisheries fund.

Personally, my interest centres on the Quebec fisheries fund. For her, the Atlantic fisheries fund will be top of mind. This is a fairly big disappointment considering that this budget fails to address a number of crises, particularly in terms of housing, seniors' purchasing power and health care.

As for the fisheries, a fisheries fund is meant to allow for innovation and scientific investment. Can my colleague explain to the House why renewing the fisheries fund, both in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, should be a priority?

[*English*]

Carol Anstey: Mr. Speaker, the member touches on something a lot of people feel in rural communities, especially coastal commu-

nities, which is that they have been left behind by the Liberal government.

The member is absolutely correct that the fishery is super important to my riding, which is why I brought forward a petition on small craft harbours, because I believe in investing in our fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. I am sure it is also super important in Quebec.

• (1240)

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, something that gets lost a lot in the House when we are talking about the budget is the human content and impact. The member gave some very good examples of real-life consequences of Liberal mismanagement, waste and overspending.

I am wondering if the member could comment further on the actual human impact this budget is going to cause.

Carol Anstey: Mr. Speaker, you are 100% right. I knocked on thousands of doors while campaigning, and I speak to constituents all the time. I speak about the issue all the time because it is so relevant and so true.

When seniors reach out to me saying they are spending the day at Tim Hortons because they cannot afford to feed themselves at home, when they should be living the rest of their life in dignity, it hurts me and makes me passionate about this.

There is a real-life consequence, and it needs to be changed. The cost of things in Newfoundland and Labrador needs to come down.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not want to ruin the member's clip, because I know it is really important to the Conservative Party of Canada, and it is important for constituents to hear their position, but the member should be speaking through the Chair.

The Deputy Speaker: Indeed, the rule is that members are not to use the word "you" in English, nor the equivalent in French. They cannot speak directly to other members; it must be done through the Chair.

Questions and comments, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear the member opposite has a passion for driving rural Canada, even if we may disagree on certain points in this place.

Two weeks ago, the member for Central Newfoundland called the national school food program "garbage". I was in Newfoundland and Labrador when the then prime minister, Trudeau, alongside Premier Furey, launched the first program of the national school food program in the member's riding, at Gros Morne elementary school.

The Budget

The program will contribute to students across the country. Does the member agree with the member for Central Newfoundland that it is garbage?

Carol Anstey: Mr. Speaker, I am passionate about my place. I hear that people want to be able to feed their kids themselves all the time, which is why they want the cost of groceries to go down.

[*Translation*]

Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Humber River—Black Creek.

It is an honour for me to rise on behalf of the people of Vaudreuil on my son Anderson's 11th birthday to speak to our new Liberal government's 2025 budget.

This budget meets the needs of Canadians at a crucial time for our country. It includes measures that will meet the needs of families and seniors and support young people. It is about making life more affordable and building a stronger country.

This budget is about building a more prosperous and resilient economy at a time when we can no longer rely on trade with our largest trading partner and when global economic uncertainty is on the rise. Affordability remains of utmost importance to Canadians. That is why, in our 2025 budget, we are cutting taxes for the middle class, which will save two-earner families \$840 a year. That means more money in people's pockets at a time when they need it the most.

It is also why we are continuing to invest in expanding the Canadian dental care plan, which is expected to save families an average of \$800 a year. The most recent expansion of the program, which is now available to those with a net family income of up to \$90,000, will benefit more than five million Canadians who have registered for it. We are making dental care a right, not a privilege. No one should have to choose between eating well and taking care of their teeth.

Budget 2025 also includes an investment to develop the national school food program brought in by our Liberal government. It will save families even more money and prevent tens of thousands of Canadian children from going to school hungry.

Making life more affordable is also about housing. Any young person trying to find their first home these days knows how hard it is, and it is not just young people. Across the country, adult children are living with their parents much longer not by choice, but because they cannot afford to pay rent, let alone buy a house. That is why in budget 2025, our government is eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes up to \$1 million, which represents tens of thousands of dollars in savings for those hoping to take this important first step.

We are also taking action on the supply side, because we know that affordability also depends on how quickly we can build more housing. That is why we are committed to doubling the pace of residential construction in Canada. To achieve this, in budget 2025, we launched Build Canada Homes, an ambitious plan to get the government back into the business of homebuilding and ramp up housing construction by leveraging Canadian technology, Canadian lumber and Canadian labour. By supporting innovative approaches

such as modular and prefabricated homes, we are reducing timelines, cutting costs and creating jobs along the way.

For anyone looking to buy their first home, rent an affordable home or help their children find a place to live, the Liberal government is listening and taking action, because all Canadians deserve a safe and affordable place to call home.

• (1245)

[*English*]

Another pillar of budget 2025 I would like to speak to is our plan to build Canada's economy of tomorrow, an economy that is more resilient, an economy that is more diversified and an economy that is less dependent on trade with the United States and that includes strong measures to protect Canadian jobs, Canadian workers and Canadian families from the unfair and unjustified tariffs put in place by President Trump.

Our plan is thoughtful and multi-faceted. First, for far too long, provincial trade barriers have fragmented our economy and slowed our growth. That is why we are harmonizing regulations, eliminating barriers to internal trade and investing in infrastructure that connects communities across provinces. We envision one country, one economy, more unified, more efficient and, yes, more competitive.

This matters to small businesses in my community of Vaudreuil looking to grow beyond Quebec. It matters to farmers in my community who need to get their products to market. It matters to every Canadian who wants to see our federation work as one team, not as 13 teams creating unnecessary barriers to prosperity.

Second, budget 2025 would invest in infrastructure, both physical infrastructure and the policy to support it, to foster a united economy, from high-speed rail to expanded port capacity, so that Canada's goods move faster and our economy becomes stronger. We are rich in natural resources, we are rich in innovation and we are rich in skilled labour.

With budget 2025, we would build the infrastructure to forge the new agreements needed to bring those assets to the world on our terms. One of those terms is to continue to build a Canada that we want and need in a sustainable way, a way that leaves a stronger, more resilient and healthy future for our children and our grandchildren.

The Budget

Budget 2025 reaffirms our commitment not to just build a stronger economy but to do so while taking decisive action against climate change. That means finding new and innovative ways to keep emissions down, and it means looking at ways in which we can get our country's energy, minerals and products to market while meeting our climate obligations to future generations.

Budget 2025 includes our Liberal government's climate competitiveness strategy. Indeed, as I have said many times in this House, climate action must continue to be intricately incorporated into Canada's economic strategy. While some would still have us believe that we have to choose between the environment and the economy, our government knows that the path to prosperity is the path to sustainability. Having served as the chair of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities for the last four years, I can attest to the benefits these investments and policies would bring from coast to coast to coast.

Third, our plan would diversify the Canadian economy by reducing our dependency on the American market while simultaneously strengthening partnerships with our allies in the G7 and the European Union and forging new trade opportunities in global markets. This approach was reflected in the choice the Prime Minister made to make France and the United Kingdom his first two international visits upon taking office, reinforcing ties with our two close friends, allies and G7 partners.

The last pillar of budget 2025 that I would like to touch on is our plan to protect Canada and Canadians. This means protecting economic sovereignty, our territorial integrity and our shared prosperity in a world that is increasingly unstable. That is why the Prime Minister's third visit was not to another capital, but to Canada's Arctic. This is no coincidence. As climate change opens new navigation routes and great powers compete for influence in the north, Canada is acting to defend our Arctic sovereignty, protect our natural environment and secure the economic future of northern communities.

We are modernizing NORAD, strengthening partnerships with Australia to deploy advanced radar systems and making historic investments in the Canadian Armed Forces to face 21st-century threats head-on. In a world marked by rising authoritarianism and global instability, Canadians deserve a Canada that has the resources, the know-how and the capacity to defend Canadian values, defend our sovereignty, support our allies and meet the moment with strength and unity.

That is why budget 2025 would make generational investments in the Canadian Armed Forces and our border security. It includes investments that would see the hiring of 1,000 new border agents to strengthen our borders, who would be trained right in my community of Vaudreuil, in the town of Rigaud. It includes investments that would see the hiring of 1,000 new RCMP officers to help keep our communities safer and combat organized crime. Budget 2025 would increase pay and benefits for our brave men and women in uniform and would make historic investments that would help equip the Canadian Armed Forces with the equipment necessary to meet the needs of Canadians here at home and meet challenges and threats abroad.

This budget lays out a clear vision and a clear plan. I am proud to support it. I am proud to be a part of this Liberal government, and above all, I am proud to serve the people of Vaudreuil, who sent me to this chamber for the fourth time this past April. I am proud to work on their behalf to try to build a better Canada for them and their families. Budget 2025 would do just that, and I invite all hon. members of this House to support it.

● (1250)

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to the Prime Minister's trip to the Arctic and the parts of the budget that would allegedly tackle some projects up there. I have been to the Arctic quite a bit, and one thing the Liberal government has a record of is incomplete projects and projects that are over budget.

We just had an Order Paper question on the Giant Mine and the \$1-billion remediation project the Conservatives started. We just found out that over \$200 million has gone to consultants.

Can the member assure Parliament that this budget will end the corruption and actually get projects done in the north?

Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, a critical part of protecting Canada's sovereignty is investing in the north, and that is exactly what we are doing with this budget. This is exactly why the Prime Minister, for his third visit, went to the north. It was to send a message not only to our partners around the world, but also to Arctic communities and Canadians that this is a priority for our new Liberal government and will be a priority moving forward.

● (1255)

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague talked about the importance of protecting jobs. Among the first victims of the current crisis are the 300 fathers and mothers who were laid off at Paccar. In a recent interview with Mario Dumont, the Liberal member for Thérèse-De Blainville told these workers not to take it personally. She encouraged them to visit food banks. She told them to come up with a plan B, change careers and go back to school. Those are the words of the Liberal member for Thérèse-De Blainville.

I want to know if that is what the member calls taking care of people, taking care of Quebec and taking care of Quebecers. More importantly, I want to know whether he agrees with the comments made by that member and the way she treats her own constituents.

Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, it is funny to hear the Bloc Québécois talk about protecting jobs. That is exactly what we are doing with the budget. We are investing to protect workers in Canada, in Quebec, in my community of Vaudreuil.

The Budget

Quebeckers want that money to be invested so their jobs can be protected. I do not understand why the Bloc Québécois wants to vote against a budget that invests in protecting Quebeckers.

I encourage my hon. colleague to vote in favour of the budget so we can work together to protect our economy at this challenging and pivotal time for our country, particularly in response to the Donald Trump administration.

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Jean-François Lévesque, the president and CEO of the south shore chamber of commerce and industry, says that the federal budget is finally sending a clear signal to businesses by making productivity a national priority.

Can my colleague send him a message?

Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that we are investing to build the economy of tomorrow and to protect jobs. The message I want to send is that we are meeting the needs of workers in my riding of Vaudreuil and workers across Canada. That is what we are doing.

If the opposition parties, and I am referring to the Bloc Québécois and the Conservatives, truly want to protect Canadians, they can do so by voting for our 2025 budget to support Canadians during this pivotal time.

[*English*]

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we know that in this budget the Liberals have not forecast beyond this fiscal year, but when it comes to wild Pacific salmon, where I come from, the Pacific salmon strategy initiative is sunseting, and so is the B.C. salmon restoration fund. Salmon are critical for our food security, our economy, our well-being and our way of life on the west coast. With these programs sunseting, that infrastructure is going to disappear.

Can my colleague make a commitment to people on the west coast to protect wild Pacific salmon and invest in habitat protection in years and decades to come?

Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, I have a high level of respect for my hon. colleague. Protecting salmon in B.C. and the livelihoods of those who depend on that industry is protecting the livelihoods of Canadians across the country. If the hon. member is asking for my support in ensuring that continues, he has it.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased today to be able to rise and speak to this incredible budget, which is a real road map toward building and strengthening our great country. We are all proud to be Canadians. The budget is clearly a forward-looking plan. There is a lot in there, and I think it is going to take some time for people to understand it all and to realize what investments we are making and what really matters.

As chair of the Standing Committee on International Trade, I will focus my remarks there. I have had the opportunity, along with great committee members, to have many different companies come forward to talk to the committee as we do a CUSMA review. We hear directly from so many businesses, individuals and professionals. They are sharing their concerns about the uncertainty they are

living under, the challenges facing them and their desire to help Canada overcome some of the challenges it is facing.

I know how deeply interconnected our prosperity is with the global economy. As the proud member of Parliament for Humber River—Black Creek, I know how important it is that our national policies deliver real, tangible benefits to the families, workers and businesses in our communities.

I recently had a meeting with the Minister of Small Business and members of the Emery Village Business Improvement Area. We talked about the pressures they were facing when it came to steel and aluminum, in particular, as well as our important auto industry, of course. I could feel their stress across the table, and their concern with everything. Some of them had businesses that their fathers had started. They looked at all of that as being at risk, with the tariffs and the kinds of pressures Canada is trying to deal with now. It was a very moving experience, and it made me that much more determined to do everything we can to find solutions, stand together and be there for them.

We are living through a time of profound global change. The rules-based international order that has supported decades of Canadian prosperity is being reshaped, whether we like it or not. Tariffs are rising, supply chains are shifting, and economic uncertainty is affecting businesses and workers across the country. Budget 2025 does not flinch. It responds with a clear plan to build Canada strong by investing in our economy, protecting our communities and empowering Canadians throughout Canada.

Canada is uniquely positioned to thrive in this new global landscape with the right investments and the right leadership, which I hope would come from all of us as members of Parliament. All parliamentarians, at this point, are being called upon to do everything we can to assist companies and families that are struggling, to do it together as parliamentarians and to put aside the partisan issues. We can do far more, and do a better job, if we do it all by working together.

The budget launches a trade diversification strategy to double overseas exports over the next decade. I have been the chair of the international trade committee for a few years now, and I have seen many companies that are very comfortable in their achievements. When asked why they were not moving forward to diversify and to reach out to other markets, the answer was that they were doing well where they were and it is complicated.

The Budget

I think part of our role as parliamentarians is to make things easier for companies to be able to diversify. We should hold their hand, if necessary. EDC does some of that, but again, it does not do enough to meet the needs of what we are dealing with today. We want our companies to feel comfortable that we can walk them through the paperwork and red tape and hold their hand to get them through those opportunities. I think more Canadian companies will do it. We talk about it, but we do not actually deliver the help quickly enough or efficiently enough to encourage them to venture overseas and diversify their markets. It is going to be really important that we do that in the future, as we move forward.

● (1300)

That means more Canadian goods. Whether it is steel from Hamilton, tech from Toronto or food from our many farms, reaching new markets and creating new jobs are imperative for a successful future for Canada.

As chair of the international trade committee, I want to highlight that this is only one of the many ways this budget aligns with the priorities we are hearing in our current study of the CUSMA trade agreement and the future of North American trade. We have heard from stakeholders across sectors that stability, predictability and enforcement are essential to maintaining confidence in our trade relationships. Budget 2025 reinforces Canada's commitment to a rules-based trading system, ensuring that our exporters can compete fairly and that our agreements are respected by everyone.

We have also heard about the need for trade infrastructure, the ports, railways and digital systems that move Canadian goods to market. This budget delivers, with major investments in infrastructure that will strengthen our supply chains and support long-term growth. Many times we have heard about the challenges in Churchill and other areas, how our ports need an investment of infrastructure dollars so they can increase their delivery. I believe the ideas that have already been put out there about the ports, the expansion and the infrastructure necessary maybe never would have happened, but now, in the situation we are in, the budget shows that we are going to be investing a lot in infrastructure so companies can get their goods to market faster.

We have heard about the importance of economic resilience, ensuring that Canada can withstand global shocks and remain competitive. Budget 2025 supports this by investing in domestic industries, diversifying our trade partnerships and launching a buy Canadian policy that prioritizes Canada suppliers and workers.

This is a budget that listens to the needs of our exporters, our manufacturers and our workers and acts decisively to support them.

Budget 2025 fast-tracks major infrastructure projects through the new Major Projects Office, streamlining approvals and getting shovels in the ground faster. As parliamentarians and former municipal councillors, we have seen the red tape and the delays in getting things through, whether at the federal, provincial or municipal level. There are always extreme delays. It takes four or five years sometimes to get some of these projects through. There needs to be an end to that. That is what I hope we will see with the Major Projects Office, which will actually streamline many of these projects, especially the infrastructure ones.

The first tranche of these projects alone will trigger \$150 billion in capital investments. Did members notice that I said “billion”? It used to be millions, and we are now talking billions. I think that is more money than any of us could even imagine. It will change Canada now and forever and create thousands of well-paying jobs. In Toronto, and especially Humber River—Black Creek, these investments will mean better transit, safer roads and more affordable housing. They will also mean good jobs in construction, engineering and the skilled trades. Yes, it will take time, but in the meantime, while we are expanding ports, building bridges and so on, all of that is creating jobs so we ensure that Canadians are working.

Through the build communities strong fund, municipalities like Toronto will have the tools they need to improve local infrastructure and support economic growth. Through Build Canada Homes, we are partnering with cities and indigenous communities to build housing at scale and speed. I have had the opportunity to visit several new initiatives when it comes to housing and see their ability to build a house in a month. We are creating homes much quicker with the prebuilds and so on. Things will be moving much faster. Again, it is all about creating jobs.

● (1305)

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite spoke a lot today about international trade and how she is the chair of the international trade committee.

As someone who has spent his entire working career in international trade and later had the privilege of serving as the trade and economy minister for Saskatchewan, where we export about 90% of what we produce, I can say with some authority on this subject that, in the past 10 years, everything the Liberal government has done has made it worse. It is every single policy, especially in the last seven months. Since the Prime Minister has taken office, every place he goes, he comes back home with more tariffs, not fewer.

Can the member highlight one thing in this budget that will help our exporters and producers move forward, and that will increase trade, not limit it?

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome the member to the House. I do not think we have had an opportunity for a discussion.

As I indicated earlier, I would welcome comments and suggestions, as I believe all parliamentarians would, as to how we can move these things forward. Part of the reason the Major Projects Office was created is so we can have opportunities to move things along. We are all well aware of the roadblocks that are there. Those have to be gone, and that is what we are trying to do with part of the investment.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech and for her comments, particularly on trade and the importance of market diversification.

My question concerns a topic of great importance to the people of the Gaspé and the Magdalen Islands. That topic is the fishing industry. The Quebec fisheries fund is a \$44-million fund that the federal was investing in. It was stimulating innovation and funding scientific research aimed at improving the productivity of the fisheries sector.

Can my colleague explain why the renewal of the fisheries fund was not included in the budget tabled this week?

• (1310)

[*English*]

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, there are a variety of different areas and different capacities. The fisheries are such an important aspect, as are the agriculture and softwood industries. There are a variety of them. If the member goes through the book very carefully, he will see the redirection of some funds going into another, more optimistic avenue in that area.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my hon. colleague for her tremendous work on this file.

Unfortunately, she did not get the chance to finish her speech. I want to give her an opportunity to add some of the comments she was not able to finish in her speech and ask her to highlight how the Liberal government is the government that has increased trade partnership across the world, more than any other government in Canada.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, we can take the time to look at what we have done in the past. This budget, with the kinds of dollars that are finally being invested in serious infrastructure, commits to moving things along faster than they previously have. There are changes being made in other regulations and so on that will really help move things forward. I am excited about the fact that we are making this commitment.

We all know it takes time and that these things do not happen overnight. I would certainly like to see it happening much faster than it did previously, when we were all tied up in regulation. We just finished signing an agreement with Indonesia. We have agreements with the Philippines and the U.K. All of those things will provide opportunities for many of our businesses to move forward.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member generously offered to accept our comments and suggestions. Just recently, Bill C-3 was passed, and there were a lot of comments and suggestions made at committee that were reversed.

The Budget

Why should we trust that our suggestions and comments will be moved forward?

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, the issues we are dealing with today in this budget and moving forward on are affecting my family and everyone else's family. We are talking about the future of my children and grandchildren. We want to see these move forward. We should all be working together.

There is no guarantee that changes made at committee are going to be—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Simcoe North.

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of the residents of Simcoe North. I will be splitting my time with the wonderful new member for Souris—Moose Mountain, who I am sure will make—

The Deputy Speaker: I am going to interrupt the member.

There seems to be a device very close to the microphone that makes it harder for the interpreters to do their work.

The member can now continue.

Adam Chambers: I apologize to our wonderful friends in interpretation. If it continues to be an issue, please let me know.

Let us get right into it. It must be really difficult to be a Liberal member of Parliament today, because here are the headlines following the budget, which is how we measure how the budget is being taken: “Budget shows Carney doesn’t know how tough it is out there on Main Street”. Another—

The Deputy Speaker: Members cannot use the name of the Prime Minister or any cabinet minister, whether directly or indirectly. When we are quoting, it is best to use the title of the member we are referring to.

I will let the member for Simcoe North resume.

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. Old habits die hard.

The headline says, “Budget shows [the Prime Minister] doesn’t know how tough it is out there on Main Street”. Another headline reads, “The Liberals’ growing deficit of trust”. Another one says that, after all the hype, the Prime Minister’s “first budget fails to meet the moment”. Another says, “Once again, [the Prime Minister] doesn’t quite live up to the hype”, followed by, “When the big day came, it wasn’t quite as advertised”. Reuters writes that the Prime Minister’s “first budget falls short on vow to transform Canadian economy”. Perhaps the most devastating is by Mr. Don Drummond, who was in the Chrétien-era finance department. He co-wrote, “A ‘generational budget’ that does little but set federal spending adrift”. This basically sums up the response to the budget

The Budget

If we are wondering how the last 10 years have gone, we only have to look at the budget itself. The government writes in its own budget, on page 53, “If Canada’s productivity growth had matched the U.S. from 2017 to 2023, the median income of a family with one child would be nearly \$11,000 higher.” This is in the government’s own publication. It is an absolutely damning account of how things have been under the Liberal government. I am shocked this made it to print and that the Liberals would admit how badly it has been going for the government.

The last 10 years have been difficult. We are trying to get over the hangover of former prime minister Trudeau. This budget completes a number of reversals of former prime minister Trudeau’s legacy. The digital services tax is gone. The luxury tax is gone. The underused housing tax is gone. The capital gains tax is gone.

The Liberals have flipped completely on stablecoins and bitcoin in this budget. Before, they made that a political football and put us behind the eight ball. When the leader of the official opposition said that Canada should be the fintech capital of the world, the government made it a political issue and instead set fintech innovation back in this country. Now, it is saying it wants to be part of the fintech revolution. It is now saying it might get rid of the emissions cap. Of course, now it is cancelling what it calls the “divisive” carbon tax. I am sorry, but the government cannot get a medal just for reversing the damage it has done.

All this talk in the budget is about economic activity that might not even occur. The superdeduction they are hanging their hat on is only about a couple of hundred million dollars more a year of stimulus than what is already there. They should have adopted the Conservative idea, which was to provide capital gains relief for Canadians or Canadian businesses when they sell an asset, if they reinvest that asset in Canada.

Even the government’s very overhyped GST cut for first-time homebuyers is only going to help a couple of thousand home purchasers a year. It could have adopted the Conservative idea, which was to cut the GST off all homes built in the year. This would help a far greater number of people and promote homebuilding in this country.

Let us remember that the government said it was going to get a lot of productive investments through SDTC and the green energy revolution. It said that we would see more productivity in electric vehicles, vaccine production facilities and ventilators that never even ended up being built. The Prime Minister is setting himself up to have a serious credibility problem. He supported the carbon tax all along the way and even disagreed with former prime minister Trudeau when they took the carbon tax off home heating in Atlantic Canada. It did not matter, anyway. He ended up cancelling the carbon tax just a few months later. Then, he called it “divisive” and said it made life more unaffordable when, before, the narrative about the carbon tax was that we were all better off having it, at the end of the month.

● (1315)

The Prime Minister wrote a book on climate change, saying that every decision in government had to be viewed through the climate prism. Now he does not really seem to talk about that very much. During the campaign, the Prime Minister said that China represent-

ed the greatest security threat to Canada, and now he says that China represents a new opportunity for Canada. Which one is it? Is China a security threat, or is it there for integration? The Prime Minister is himself showing that we simply cannot trust what he says, but the proof will be in the pudding.

One of my favourite high school teachers, a wonderful man named Mr. Cercone, said that it does not matter how much one makes but how much one spends. The bottom line is that people can be wealthy if they watch their expenditures, but the results of this fiscal plan are absolutely devastating for future generations. We used to spend about six cents of every dollar on interest payments on the national debt. That is now projected to more than double to 13¢ of every dollar. That will be about \$76 billion of money going to bondholders and bankers instead of paying for social services. Even the IMF, which the government loves to trot out because it loves multilateral institutions, says that for the amount of money a government spends on interest on the debt, there is a corresponding decline in the amount of money that is spent on social services.

The government is also borrowing record amounts of money in the bond markets each year. Why does that matter? That matters for two reasons. One is that it always borrows on the short term, which means it has to roll this debt over year after year. This means the government is very sensitive to interest rate increases, and the Bank of Canada has warned now that 40% of the purchasers of government debt are actually hedge funds, which rely on buying and selling major government debts from all over the world and trading them immediately. If that system does not continue to work as it is working, we will see yields spike in Canada. That means higher interest rates, and higher interest rates mean higher debt service costs.

We are already spending more on servicing the debt than we send to the provinces for health care every year. We are spending more on servicing our debt than the government takes in from the GST every year. The GST that Canadians pay every day on every purchase they make, whether it is buying a car, items at a grocery store, clothing for some kids or basically anything, that amount of money for GST on every receipt we see does not even cover the interest payments on the national debt.

It is for these reasons that Conservatives cannot support the budget. The finance minister now has a new fiscal anchor, and I am willing to bet the fiscal anchor of deficit-to-GDP will be broken, because he is already close to breaking the fiscal anchor he set for himself in the budget two days ago.

● (1320)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. The member is pretty artful, so I am sure he can answer both.

The Budget

I think the Conservatives need to pick a lane on China. I hear members of Parliament, particularly from the western provinces, talking about the importance of engaging China to remove canola tariffs. The member suggests that engaging China is a bad idea. I think the Conservatives ought to get their position clear about where they stand on that engagement.

More importantly, on the debt that the member referenced, he talked about this being catastrophic and unsustainable. Will the member at least recognize that we are spending about 10¢ of every dollar on debt servicing? In 1990, it was 35¢. We are nowhere near the fiscal trajectory we were on back in 1990, and the government's plan is sustainable over time.

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are not on a sustainable track, because they have more than doubled the amount we spend on debt service costs. It is only going up, and that is if nothing changes. It was six cents in 2015; it is going to be 13¢ in just a couple of years, and that is if absolutely nothing changes. I do not believe that this is a sustainable path. Even former bank governor David Dodge says we have to be really worried when the government gets over 10%, or 10¢ of every dollar spent.

As it relates to China, it is actually the Prime Minister who has to answer to this House as to why, just a few short months ago, he said China represented the greatest security threat to this country and now he seems to be engaging and playing footsie with it under the table.

• (1325)

[Translation]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, earlier, the member for York Centre said in his speech that Canada is importing oil and oil products from Russia. I asked him to clarify and to give some numbers because I know that that is not allowed. Canada has been banning oil imports from Russia since 2022, and we have not imported any oil from there since 2019. He told me that Canada imported oil from Russia last year and that we also imported oil from Venezuela.

It is all well and good to have debates and disagreements, but we need to make sure that they are based on facts. If it is true that Canada is still importing oil from Russia or Venezuela in various ways, using loopholes that I am not aware of, as a supporter of Ukraine, I think that is totally unacceptable and that it should be denounced.

I would like to know whether the Conservative Party is stating that Canada is still importing oil from Russia, despite the ban. Is that the party's position?

[English]

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I did not hear the intervention from my hon. colleague, and I am not sure of the stat he was referring to. I believe there have been some credible sources suggesting that because certain oil is being mixed from certain jurisdictions in the world, some shipments of oil around the world may contain Russian oil. That is obviously something that would be very concerning if any of that oil ends up on Canadian shores.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the budget spends a lot of money on some things, but it also

promises to cut spending, including on services that Canadians value. I asked a question about this earlier this morning and was supposed to be reassured by an answer from my colleagues that the CRA would be stepping in to improve efficiencies by filing tax returns presumptively for a number of Canadians.

With the CRA's accuracy rate below 20% in the case of humans and only at a third in the case of its chatbots, I am wondering if the hon. member could comment on the importance of these services to Canadians and improving government services, especially at this critical time for our country.

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, we absolutely need to improve the services for Canadians, but I would caution the government when it wants to increase services that do not exist today for Canadians while there are still two-hour waits on hold at the CRA when people call. I am not sure that giving the CRA additional things to do is going to provide the service the Liberals think.

The CRA has already been trying to file taxes on behalf of millions of Canadians who do not file taxes through a telefile program. The results of that have been incredibly underwhelming, so I am unclear as to what the Liberals think they are going to achieve by doing this.

By the way, do people trust the CRA to do their taxes properly on their behalf? I think it sounds like a bit of a conflict of interest.

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know that you are a bit of a student of history, and I just want to point out that 158 years ago today was the first convening of the Parliament of Canada.

For 148 of those years, all the governments that we have had combined spent less than the Liberals have spent in the last 10 years. I know that when Canadians heard the title of the budget, "Canada Strong", they expected a budget that would be more affordable, would reward hard work and would restore confidence in our future. Instead, the Minister of Finance has delivered a budget that spends more, borrows more and achieves less.

It is the 10th Liberal budget, and after nearly a decade of reckless Liberal spending, Canadians are poorer, investment is weaker and our economy is falling further behind those of our global competitors. This is not strength. This is stubbornness disguised as leadership.

The Budget

The Minister of Finance told Canadians he would control spending and bring discipline back to Ottawa, but, once again, the government could not resist the temptation to use borrowed money to paper over deeper concerns. He promised to rein in deficits, but the deficit continues to grow. He promised to make life more affordable, yet Canadians are hit with higher costs on everything: groceries, fuel, housing and interest rates. He promised that the budget would rebuild confidence, but confidence is collapsing, investment is leaving and Canadian productivity, the backbone of our standard of living, remains stuck in neutral.

For all that talk about nation building, the budget continues a dangerous pattern of more debt, more bureaucracy and no results. The government now spends more money on interest payments than it does on health care. That is not a sign of a strong nation. That is the sign of a government that refuses to make the hard choices.

Canadians are making sacrifices every day, but the federal government refuses to make any on their behalf. Every dollar spent on servicing the debt is a dollar that we cannot spend on helping seniors, supporting hospitals or investing in infrastructure. This is not sustainable, and it is not responsible.

I want to share a story from a farm family I met recently in my riding. It was nothing dramatic, just coffee at a kitchen table and a conversation about how things were going on their farm. They run a small mixed operation, grain and cattle. They are not the type to complain. They are the kind of family who gets up early, works late and steps up when their neighbours need help. As we talked, the wife said something very interesting to me. She said, “We’ve always been careful with money, but in the past year everything has just moved faster than we can keep up with.” Fuel, fertilizer, repairs, insurance, groceries, every single cost went up, but their income did not.

Like so many young farm families, they are doing everything right. They are managing their debt, working extra hours and cutting back where they can, but they are still falling behind. Then she told me something I did not expect to hear from farmers. She said, quietly, “We had to go to the food bank.” Then she added something that cut right to the heart of it, “We’re farmers. We feed Canada and the world, and now we rely on the food bank to feed our own family.”

She was not asking for sympathy. She was not angry. She was embarrassed, but she should not have to be. This is a family that works at community fundraisers, helps neighbours and contributes to feeding the entire country and the world. After nearly 10 years of Liberal policies driving up costs at every turn, even the people who feed Canada cannot reliably feed their own children.

This is not what a strong country looks like. It is not the Canada they were promised. If there is one symbol of prairie success, it is canola, a made-in-Canada innovation that farmers turned into a world-leading crop. However, the government has failed to defend the success that canola represents. Foreign tariffs remain in place, trade barriers continue and market access is shrinking.

Instead of fighting for our producers, the government issues press releases and photo ops, while the actual work of trade sits un-

done. Instead of lowering taxes on fuel and fertilizer, the government raises them. Instead of helping producers move product to market, it creates layers of new red tape.

Farmers do not need handouts; they need trade deals and respect. The budget delivers neither.

● (1330)

This budget claims to invest in the future, but when we read the details, the Prairies are treated as an afterthought again. There is no plan for the roads or rail lines that move our exports, there is no meaningful investment in trade corridors and there is no support for the rural infrastructure, water, broadband and bridges that communities depend on. Instead, we get another Ottawa-run sovereign fund and another layer of bureaucracy deciding which regions get attention and which get ignored. This is not partnership; this is paternalism. Prairie people do not need Ottawa to run more programs. They just need Ottawa to get out of the way.

The same neglect extends to our resource industries, which build our economy, fund our social programs and support thousands of hard-working families. From the potash mines around Rocanville to the oil fields near Estevan and Weyburn, workers are ready to innovate, grow and help make Canada energy-independent. However, this budget offers nothing to accelerate responsible development, nothing to improve regulatory timelines and nothing to secure long-term export capacity. Instead, the government is layering on new rules, new taxes and new delays that would make it harder for projects to move forward and easier for investors to look elsewhere.

A strong country needs strong resource industries, but this budget would weaken them instead of strengthening them. For all the money that is being spent, there is almost nothing in this budget to make our country more productive. There is no plan to make it easier to start a business, no plan to reduce red tape or regulatory duplication and no plan to attract investment and keep it here.

The Minister of Finance talks about “inclusive growth”, but Canadians are excluded. They need opportunity. They need confidence that their hard work will pay off. This budget does not deliver that confidence.

Conservatives cannot support this budget for one simple reason: It would make life harder for the very people it claims to help. It would drive up inflation through uncontrolled spending, discourage investment through higher taxes and regulation, undermine the provinces through federal overreach, and ignore the sectors of agriculture, energy and manufacturing that create wealth.

The Budget

Canadians are not asking for more programs. They are asking for the ability to get ahead by their own hard work. This budget would make that harder, not easier.

Conservatives believe in a Canada that works for the people who do the work. We believe in rewarding effort, not punishing it. We believe that every region and every province should have the same chance to succeed. We believe a government should respect the people who feed us, build our homes and power our economy. Our vision is simple. We would make life affordable again, end inflationary spending and build homes and infrastructure more quickly. We would celebrate agriculture and resource development, not punish it, and restore hope in hard work so that once again it will be enough. That is the country we believe in.

This budget tells Canadians that the government knows best. Conservatives believe Canadians know best.

This budget would grow the government while shrinking opportunity. It would punish work, erode trust and leave entire generations behind. For that hard-working family in my riding and countless others like them across this country, Conservatives cannot and will not support this budget. The real strength of Canada does not come from another deficit or another announcement, but from the Canadians who build, grow and produce the wealth that keeps this nation alive. They deserve a government that trusts them, respects them and finally stands up for them.

• (1335)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned two issues that are important to me. One is agriculture and the other is canola. Having worked on this file and having sat in on the bilateral meeting the Prime Minister just had with President Xi, I would ask the hon. member about two things.

First, I hear consistently from the Conservative benches that we should not, as a government, be engaging with or trying to recalibrate the relationship with China. I am wondering if he could give his thoughts on that, given how important it is in his constituency. I wonder whether he might engage and share some wisdom with some of his colleagues about the importance of doing that, if we are going to support western farmers.

Second, he talked about there being a lack of emphasis in the budget on agriculture. I reject that premise. A number of issues around agriculture have been mentioned, including supports. What I find most surprising, though, is that there was nothing in the Conservative platform for agriculture whatsoever. Would he have a comment on that as well?

Steven Bonk: Mr. Speaker, trade with China is extremely important to the canola sector, but it seems that every time the Liberal government engages with China, it comes home with a new tariff. The next time they are in negotiations, I want the Liberals to take a better look at the people who are feeding the country and supporting agriculture, and the many jobs they support across the entire industry. It is something we need to take this seriously. We need to come home with results, instead of empty words, promises and photo ops.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage with my colleague on a matter of great concern to me, specifically science, research and innovation. As the Bloc Québécois critic for this file, I always make it my duty to express the concerns and demands of the scientific community.

This budget does not include any increase in funding for the three granting agencies or anything to boost student scholarships. There is nothing to offset the inflation that is stifling university researchers. This government claims that it wants to be the world leader in innovation, but innovation requires research.

Could my colleague explain how this government can claim to be leading the world in innovation when it refuses to invest in the science that makes that possible?

[*English*]

Steven Bonk: Mr. Speaker, I will speak to agriculture. Canada is leading in many sectors of innovation when it comes to agriculture, but because of the lack of supports and the systems that are in place, which actually make it harder for innovation to come to market in Canada, we find that a lot of our entrepreneurs and innovators are developing their products in Canada and then leaving for other jurisdictions. This was not addressed in the budget, but it is very important for the future growth of Canada.

• (1340)

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government wants to borrow \$321 billion over the next four years, borrowing \$78 billion in this year alone. That represents \$8,000 per Canadian. Where is the prosperity in the budget? Where are the benefits to Canadians in the budget? It would put an additional \$8,000 on the shoulders of each and every single Canadian.

Steven Bonk: Mr. Speaker, that question hits exactly the point I made in my speech regarding the farm family I met.

The government is spending so recklessly. Every time it prints money, it increases inflation. Every time it increases inflation, it increases the price of all of the goods farmers have to buy, all of their inputs and all of their daily living expenses. There is a real human cost to these overruns and these deficits. I wish the Liberals would take that a bit more seriously, instead of thinking there is an unlimited piggy bank.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member really surprised me when he talked earlier about the role he played in Saskatchewan. He talked about the importance of trade. When we think of trade, we could talk about what the Prime Minister has done to date.

The Budget

Let there be no doubt about this. Looking at the last 10 years, we have seen more trade agreements signed than in any government before this one, yet the member tried to give the false impression that trade may not be good for the Canadian farmers in the Prairies. I am from the Prairies. Trade agreements are a good thing. No government in the last—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the parliamentary secretary to give the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain a chance to respond in 25 seconds or less.

Steven Bonk: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member opposite that everything he just said was recorded. He should go back and look at what I actually said so he knows he is putting words in my mouth, because I definitely did not mean that. Trade is extremely important to us and we need to promote it, not discourage it as the Prime Minister has been doing.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise here this afternoon to talk about the budget the government tabled this week.

I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Pickering—Brooklin.

We are living in an uncertain world. The U.S. administration's change in its approach to trade, including global tariffs, is having a major impact on the global economy and Canadian industry. Countries are increasingly looking inward. That is not necessarily positive for a country like Canada, which is truly an exporting nation. Geopolitical conflict, with the wars in Europe, Ukraine, Gaza and Africa, is creating instability as well.

Although artificial intelligence creates and has an opportunity for immense potential, it also has the opportunity to shape things in a negative way, depending on how that technology is deployed. It is undoubtedly disruptive.

Simply put, now is a critical time for Canada, and the budget tabled this week is a true road map for Canadian prosperity and our shared pathway forward.

This budget has three major pillars. The first is a laser focus on growing and strengthening the Canadian economy, and I appreciate that the Prime Minister has shown a focus in this regard. The second is affordability, housing and empowering Canadians. The third is protecting Canadian communities and sovereignty. This would all be done while maintaining fiscal discipline and recalibrating public spending.

I want to start there. Whether we hear it from the opposition benches or we see it in certain social media posts, the idea that Canada's fiscal track is unsustainable or that it is not a possible pathway forward is simply untrue. I am going to share some facts to hopefully highlight and give comfort to Canadians at home that we are in a strong fiscal position. We have to be mindful and prudent, as the government is demonstrating, but we are not in the chaotic and reckless world that the Conservatives would have everyone believe we are in.

It is important for Canadians to understand that the government is committing to balancing the operating side of the ledger in the budget in the next three years. The government is looking at gov-

ernment expenses and saying we need to make sure that we are living within our means on operating and program spending, but it also recognizing that now is a time to build and make capital investments that will have positive, long-term economic consequences for the Canadian economy. We are focused on reining in public spending within three years, but are keeping room for longer-term capital spends.

It is important to recognize that this budget projects a stable, declining net debt-to-GDP ratio over time. Of course, that is the size of Canada's debt as a proportion of its economy, which will stay in the range of 42% to 43% of GDP over time. Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We rarely, if ever, hear that from the opposition benches. This is in contrast to comparable countries like the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Japan. Canada has a stable financial track. We also have the second-lowest deficit proportionate to our economy in the G7.

We have heard from the opposition benches the idea that the debt servicing costs are unsustainable. We need to put that into context. I was born in 1991, and the 1990s were a time when Canada was in a truly difficult financial period. For example, in 1990, the Government of Canada was spending, on average, 35¢ of every dollar toward servicing its debt alone. That means 35% of the government's entire expenditure was on servicing debt. Right now, we are at around 10¢ for every dollar spent.

I have no problem with members across the way talking about the importance of prudence in our fiscal approach and being mindful of public spending. That is all fair game. However, when certain Conservatives stand up and suggest that Canada's fiscal track is completely unsustainable, that we are in a chaotic period and that generations of Canadians will never be able to make a future because the debt is unsustainable, it is simply not true. I am living proof. We were at 35% of our expenditure in 1990. My generation has a bright future in Canada moving forward. We are nowhere near those levels, and the government is demonstrating that we are not ever going to get near those levels with our pathway forward.

• (1345)

Growing the economy is essential, particularly with some of the challenges that we are facing as a country. The Prime Minister has been saying for us to focus on what we can control about economic growth in this country while we also engage around the world. Canada has what the world wants and needs, whether it is in agriculture, natural resources, energy or critical minerals, and now is the time to make sure that we can feed, fuel and power the world.

The Budget

I was particularly pleased to see a large emphasis on agriculture. Kings—Hants is the largest agricultural riding in Atlantic Canada. Whether it is horticulture, fruit growing, beef products or the emerging grain sector, we have what the world needs. I want to give a compliment to the Minister of Agriculture, who was recently in Mexico promoting eastern Canadian apples. We have an opportunity to do more trade in those areas.

Also, there is the Minister of International Trade and the trade agreement we recently signed with Indonesia. I also think of Vietnam. Southeast Asia is a world of opportunity for our Nova Scotia fruit growers to be able to export more of our apples from the Annapolis Valley and find more markets around the world.

Forestry is extremely important in Kings—Hants as well, and I was pleased to see that there is a significant emphasis in this budget on programming to support the forestry sector, notably, the investment tax credit on biowaste. I think about Ledwidge Lumber and the work it is doing to create a facility for sustainable jet fuel. This is the type of tax credit that can be used to help support those projects. I also think about the mass timber facility and the financing that was announced through the forestry innovation programs of NRCan. A replenishment of that fund is going to support the types of activities where we have good, quality jobs in Kings—Hants tied to the forestry sector. It is really important to see.

We know that infrastructure is an important catalyst for growth in our communities. I have had the good fortune of having many infrastructure announcements over the last six years that are supporting our communities in the counties of Kings and Hants. I think about the Kings county municipal council, for example, trying to advance its recreational complex. The government has made a commitment to put \$51 billion of investment in infrastructure over the next 10 years, and those programs are going to matter when these projects come to the Government of Canada as we will have the ability to fund, help support and contribute to them. I also think that in East Hants and West Hants, whether it is infrastructure for housing or waste water, this infrastructure spending is going to be extremely important.

On major national projects, we are working across the country to advance these projects in earnest. This is going to be important for the national economy. In Atlantic Canada, there has been reference to wind west and offshore wind potential. I think that is extremely important. There is more work to be done on that file, but we are willing to work with the provinces. There would also be investment tax credits for critical minerals and our mining sector. These really do matter.

On competitiveness, I would like to highlight the fact that we are focused on the superdeduction. This is an accelerated cost of capital allowance through which businesses would be able to write off expenditures very quickly. It is a competitive measure, and it would mean that Canada's marginal effective tax rate would be the lowest in the G7. This is important for the competitiveness of businesses, both large and small, in making sure that they have the ability to move forward.

On affordability, 22 million Canadians would benefit from the tax credit we are putting forward. The removal of GST for new

construction for first-time homebuyers is an extremely important measure that will matter in Kings—Hants.

We have committed to the national school food program and making that program permanent. I was deeply disappointed by the comments from the member for Central Newfoundland, from the Conservative party, who called this program “garbage”. That is deeply disturbing. There are members in our communities in Kings—Hants who have fought very hard for this type of programming. It matters in conjunction with provincial resourcing because it matters for kids.

On Build Canada Homes, there is \$13 billion that would go toward working to build affordable housing in this country.

There are supports for personal service workers and also a lot of emphasis on young Canadians, including through replenishment and an augmentation of the Canada summer jobs program. This matters for small businesses and not-for-profits but, most importantly, it matters for young workers.

Last, and I am going to leave it here, there would be a generational investment in our Canadian Armed Forces. This is extremely important.

I see I am coming to the end of my time. I look forward to adding a bit extra when my colleagues ask me questions.

• (1350)

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I found the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister's comments about agriculture to be extremely rich, especially when, during debate today, he has risen a couple of times to talk about China.

The tariffs we have right now on canola, which is produced in my riding, and hogs, which are produced in my riding, are directly impacting family members, never mind the greater constituency that I represent in Manitoba. All of those tariffs are because of the actions of the Liberal government. The admonishment that Trudeau gave when he was prime minister to the President of China, Xi Jinping, caused the rift we have right now in Canada-China relations, and the EV tariffs the Liberals put in place are why we have the extra retaliatory tariffs against Canada.

The Liberals are to blame for it. Why are they not fixing it?

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I was with the Prime Minister in Korea when we had the bilateral with President Xi. It is the first time in eight years that that has happened. It is an important step in resolving the issues the member mentioned.

The Budget

The Conservatives need to pick a lane. I have heard consistently, including from the member for Simcoe North, that Canada should not be engaging with China, that we should not be having discussions. Now this member from the Conservative benches stands up to say we should be doing more to engage with China. The Conservatives really need to determine what lane they are going to pick.

Our lane is very clear. We believe we can recalibrate the relationship in a pragmatic and constructive way. We are undertaking that work. That is the work we will do for farmers across the country.

Speaking of farmers, I would ask the member to go back to look at his platform from April. There was not one single word about Canadian farmers in what the Conservatives promised in their platform. It is shameful.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the speech by my colleague from Kings—Hants. However, what the people on the other side of the House are saying about the forestry sector is totally outrageous. In his speech, the member boasted about measures for the forestry sector.

The government is going to give \$100 billion in tax credits to the oil and gas industry until 2040, but there is absolutely nothing for forestry. Last week, on Wednesday, October 29, industry and union representatives and municipal officials came to Parliament Hill to make an innovative proposal, namely that the government purchase 50% of the countervailing duties imposed across the border and get its money back when the dispute is resolved. This proposal would give the industry access to cash flow. The government did nothing when those people came to the Hill.

How does my colleague explain that?

• (1355)

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, that is not true. There are various measures for the forestry sector in the budget. We are providing \$1.2 billion to support the forestry industry across the country, in Nova Scotia, Quebec and British Columbia. Yes, in the context of negotiations with the United States, the minister responsible for Canada-U.S. relations is very aware of this issue. We understand the importance of forestry workers across Canada.

[*English*]

Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the end of my colleague's speech, he touched on the investments in this budget in defence, which is of significant net benefit for the entire country, but particularly for Nova Scotia, where for centuries we have had a disproportionately high rate of veterans in military service. I wonder if the member could touch a bit on how he expects that will help his constituents in Kings—Hants and the entire country.

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I am really proud of the investments the government is making in defence. This is important for our men and women in uniform. It is also part of a defence industrial policy to create good jobs across the country.

When I think about Nova Scotia, I think about IMP Aerospace. I know the member is well familiar as there are many constituents in his riding who work at that facility. We have some work we can do

to help support IMP to be able to take advantage of the procurement that exists with our Royal Canadian Air Force over the days ahead.

I think about CFB Greenwood, and there is a huge opportunity in military housing that would benefit not only the community in Kings county, but also, most importantly, our CAF membership.

These are the types of projects that I and the government want to work on together, collaboratively with all members of the House, because they are important for our defence, they are important for our economy and they matter to the men and women in uniform.

Given the fact it is Remembrance Day week, let me thank every member of the Canadian Armed Forces.

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to take part in today's debate on budget 2025, "Canada Strong". As we know, advanced economies around the world are facing global economic headwinds, and Canada is no exception. With the historic rise in tariffs affecting our economy, Canadians are feeling the pressure in their day-to-day lives.

Canadians do not need more talk about challenges. They need a plan, a plan for what comes next. That is exactly what budget 2025 delivers. This is an investment budget. It is a confident Canada taking control of its future. It is a plan that invests in people, opportunity and our communities.

The question I hear most often in Pickering—Brooklin from young families, new graduates and even long-term residents is simple: "Can we afford to build our future here?" We know the housing market has begun to soften and prices have started to stabilize in the last few months. This is encouraging, but for many, owning a home still feels just out of reach. For renters, affordability and stability remain real concerns.

Budget 2025 delivers a real plan to build more homes faster and make them affordable again. Through Build Canada Homes, the government is investing \$13 billion over five years to double the pace of homebuilding over the next decade. This initiative would help build affordable homes across the country while modernizing how we build, using new technology, partnerships and financing tools to get shovels in the ground sooner.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honour the great work of Habitat for Humanity Canada and, in particular, Habitat for Humanity Greater Ottawa.

By leveraging non-market financing, volunteer labour and donated goods, and by tying mortgage payments to income, Habitat gets families into affordable homes. I have participated in a Habitat build and seen the joy on the faces of the people helping. The greatest thing of all was seeing the smiles on the faces of children when they and their families received keys to their new homes. Safe and affordable home ownership changes lives, and even a child understands that.

I want to thank Sara Cooper, the entire Habitat for Humanity Greater Ottawa team, volunteers and donors for the transformative difference they are making in people's lives.

Go, Habitat, go.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the history of business is filled with scandals and scams as companies cooked the books to hide financial disaster. The Lehman Brothers global financial services firm hid more than \$50 billion in loans disguised as sales. Bernie Madoff conducted the largest Ponzi scheme in history, defrauding investors of almost \$65 billion. Enron, the energy company, kept huge debts off the balance sheet, costing shareholders \$74 billion.

The new Liberal budget reminds me of those scandals. The Liberals want to increase the national debt by \$321 billion, with a \$78-billion deficit this year alone. They changed the accounting method and hid the true debt by calling it “investment”. Canadians are not fooled. They know they are once again being asked to pay the bill for Liberal mismanagement.

The finance minister and his buddies need to learn that scammers always get found out.

* * *

AWARD FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shane MacLeod, a teacher in my riding and the recipient of the Prime Minister's Award for Teaching Excellence in STEM.

Mr. MacLeod's approach to science education is defined by innovation and inclusion. He integrates current events and lived experiences into physics and environmental science, helping students see themselves in the material and understand how science shapes our world. This includes his popular YouTube channel, which features at-home experiments and demonstrations filmed on his front porch. He also uses a mastery-based testing model that lets students

Statements by Members

rewrite exams after receiving feedback, helping them build confidence and a deeper understanding of difficult concepts.

Beyond his own classroom, Mr. MacLeod has trained science teachers across Canada through the Perimeter Institute, published peer-reviewed research and led programs that open STEM pathways for girls and African Nova Scotian students.

I ask all members of the House to join me in congratulating Mr. MacLeod on this well-earned recognition.

* * *

AFFORDABILITY

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's budget presented a \$78.2-billion deficit, driving up prices and making life more expensive for families all across Canada. Food inflation is skyrocketing and made worse by the government's massive debts.

This year, food bank visits in Canada hit 2.2 million. Ten years ago, in Parry Sound—Muskoka, an idyllic rural collection of small communities where neighbours take care of each other, the food programs that were needed back then were Salvation Army food drives at holiday times. Today, there are 16 food-related charities in Parry Sound—Muskoka. From communities like Bracebridge and Huntsville, which are towns with three different food-distribution charities, to the many tiny communities of a few hundred people, like Argyle, Burk's Falls and Honey Harbour, food banks are essential lifelines in every corner of the riding. These small food programs in Parry Sound—Muskoka are struggling to keep up with the need.

As the amazing people of Parry Sound—Muskoka continue to support each other, they also beg the government to please stop making life so expensive for them and all their neighbours.

* * *

[Translation]

ÔCHAMPFLEURY

Carlos Leitão (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about ôChampfleury, an important organization in my community, in Laval.

For over 35 years, ôChampfleury has been a fixture in the community, providing essential programs and services that bring citizens together and strengthen the fabric of our society. Whether it is through activities for young people, support for families, cultural events or community involvement, ôChampfleury makes a real difference in the lives of the residents of Laval.

Statements by Members

The organization is guided by its mission: family, joy, respect and ambition. These values reflect its commitment to supporting and enriching the lives of all members.

I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone who is involved with ôChampfleury for their outstanding commitment to improving the quality of life of so many families.

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

LORNE BENEDICT PLEMEL

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to pay tribute to Major Lorne Benedict Plemel.

Raised on a family farm in St. Gregor, he joined the military at the age of 17 and served the guns of the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery and the Royal Canadian Artillery for 38 years, climbing the ranks from gunner to major, a remarkable feat in itself. His service included many peacekeeping missions and tours of duty in Afghanistan with NATO.

While he never sought accolades, Major Plemel's dedication did not go unnoticed. Among his many awards are the Order of Military Merit and the Chief of the Defence Staff Commendation. His decision to stand on guard for our country deserves our gratitude. We are grateful to him and his family for the sacrifices they made to keep our nation strong and free.

Major Plemel has been laid to rest, but he will always be remembered for his love of country, family and friends, a true hero from Saskatchewan and a truly great Canadian.

I thank Leroy for his service.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Pauline Rochefort (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of budget 2025.

In preparation for the budget, I had the pleasure of meeting with many different organizations and, certainly, people of all ages, including young people in my riding of Nipissing—Timiskaming. One such group was the Embers, an inspiring group of young Girl Guides. In relation to the budget, they shared what matters most to them: helping communities grow, caring for the planet, supporting those in need and showing kindness to others. I was pleased to see that budget 2025 delivers on these values, as it invests \$660 million in women's equality and leadership. It also includes many other strategic investments that ensure a secure future for young people in Canada.

I conclude by saying that the Embers remind us that real leadership begins with care and compassion. On their behalf, I thank the government for creating a future where every young girl knows her voice matters, and I encourage all colleagues in the House to support—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

THE PRIME MINISTER

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's company, Brookfield, has been exposed as Canada's biggest tax-dodger. Brookfield managed to avoid paying a staggering \$6.5 billion in Canadian taxes. As chair of Brookfield, the Prime Minister registered three multi-billion dollar investment funds in the Cayman Islands and above a bike shop in Bermuda, all to avoid paying Canadian taxes. On one hand, in his new budget, he is asking hard-working Canadians to fund a \$78.3-billion deficit. On the other hand, he has saved his elitist friends from paying \$6.5 billion in taxes. It is no wonder that the Prime Minister got all the Liberals to vote against having Brookfield come to Ottawa to answer to Canadians.

The Prime Minister's new budget wants to build Canada strong, but I think we can all agree that Canada would be much stronger if Brookfield paid its taxes right here at home.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PORT OF BAIE-COMEAU

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome representatives from the Port of Baie-Comeau to Parliament Hill today, and I especially want to welcome its president and CEO Karine Otis, a woman I admire.

Like them, I am here to talk about the north shore, Baie-Comeau and our port, which is a gateway to the entire world. It has close ties with the Port of Rotterdam, which is Europe's largest port, and it is second to none with a leader like Ms. Otis at the helm.

The Port of Baie-Comeau is prosperous and teeming with activity, since it handles four million tonnes of goods annually and is the fourth-largest port of call for international cruises. We could not be prouder of our port and its entire team and board of directors, who are catalyzing innovation, economic development and wealth not only in the Baie-Comeau community, but on the whole north shore.

Karine can always count on my full support as an ally to bring about the future she is forging day after day, a future as boundless as our north shore.

• (1410)

[English]

CANADIAN MUSIC CREATOR DAY

David Myles (Fredericton—Oromocto, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of SOCAN, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada, I would like to invite everyone to celebrate the first-ever Canadian Music Creator Day on Friday, November 7.

[Translation]

Canadian Music Creator Day reaffirms SOCAN's mission to ensure that Canadian music creators are respected, recognized and fairly compensated.

[English]

SOCAN has been doing this important work for 100 years. The date, November 7, was chosen to honour the birthday of one of the greatest songwriters of all time from Canada, Joni Mitchell.

I invite everyone to sit down and enjoy their favourite Joni song tomorrow, or a song by any other amazing Canadian, and to honour the great musical creators of this country on Canadian Music Creator Day.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes directly out of Canadians' pockets. The Liberal government's 10th budget delivers the largest deficit outside of the COVID years at \$78 billion. It will add more fuel to the inflation fire, and Canadians will continue to struggle to afford groceries. Poverty and food insecurity have risen nearly 40% in just two years, yet the Liberals keep gaslighting Canadians by insisting their hidden taxes on food and fuel are imaginary. Conservatives have put forward real solutions to make life affordable, such as cutting the industrial carbon tax, the food-packaging tax and the fuel standards tax. Instead, the Liberals chose to give tax breaks to elites purchasing private jets and yachts.

My neighbours in Oshawa are clear. They do not want a costly election. They wanted an affordable budget. Conservatives want a hopeful future. For our young people, we want homes, jobs and hope. For our seniors, we want affordability. We want to bring back the promise of Canada.

* * *

FORESTRY SECTOR

Corey Hogan (Calgary Confederation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, forestry is core to our Canadian identity and the backbone of communities across Canada. This vital sector provides good jobs, drives local economies and keeps our towns and cities growing.

Recently, during National Forest Week, the Forest Products Association of Canada held its annual national forest policy conference here in Ottawa. This conference brought together leaders in forestry from across Canada. It advocated and brought forward ideas for the forestry sector and the over 200,000 jobs it sustains. I want to extend a special thanks to the workers who power this industry, as well as all those who attended.

Statements by Members

Forestry supports our Canadian way of life. As Canadians, we need to support forestry, not just during these trying times of trade disputes but always. Let us work together across party lines to defend and grow this vibrant sector. When forestry is strong, Canada is strong.

* * *

MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES

Rob Morrison (Columbia—Kootenay—Southern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision in this case is devastating: Two men were found with hundreds of images and videos of children, some as young as three years old. One had 317 images, mostly of little girls between three and six. The other had hundreds of videos of children between five and 10. These are not victimless crimes. Every image is a real child hurt, humiliated and forever changed. Those children deserve justice, not excuses, yet the court chose to focus on theory instead of the horrifying facts in front of them.

Canadians know justice means protecting the most vulnerable among us. A future Conservative government will use the notwithstanding clause to overturn this ruling. We will restore mandatory minimum sentences for child sexual abuse material and ensure predators face the full weight of the law.

* * *

[Translation]

FOOD DRIVES

Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the holiday season approaches, our communities are mobilizing to help those most in need. Food drives organized by big-hearted volunteers remind us of the importance of community and sharing. Every donation, large or small, helps provide food security to disadvantaged families and offers a little comfort to those for whom this time of year can be very difficult.

I would like to commend the remarkable work of the community organizations, food banks, parishes and active citizens in Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation that devote themselves tirelessly to ensuring that no one is forgotten.

In this season of generosity, I invite all Canadians to give from the heart so that every family can celebrate Christmas with dignity and hope.

Oral Questions

• (1415)
[English]

THE BUDGET

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this budget is a booby-trapped blueprint that burdens the next generation with back-breaking bills and broken balances.

While the Prime Minister boasts and brags, young Canadians are being buried beneath a \$78-billion deficit bombshell. That is not just a blunder; it is a brazen breach of trust. He blurted he would bring down spending, but instead his first budget ballooned by \$90 billion, bankrupting blue-collar breadwinners and blaming everyone but himself.

Now interest payments on the national debt have ballooned beyond what we budget for health care transfers, and every household is being billed an extra \$5,400 in bloated inflationary spending, which is a brutal blow to families already barely getting by.

Basic needs are being bumped for banker buddies and bloated bureaucracy, and what is the bottom line for our youth? It is bleak futures and broken dreams. Behind the buzzwords and back-patting, this budget is a bad bargain for Canadians. It is time to bring back balance, build responsibly and break free from this cycle of borrowing, bluffing and betrayal.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget is all about building Canada strong. The government cares about people. That is why we see the dental program, child care and a national school food program that is going to be there for over 400,000 children. The budget is about building a community. It is investing in Canada. Think of our hospitals, our streets, our bridges and our communities. Our budget is all about investing in Canadians. The Conservatives do not believe in Canada, but the Prime Minister and the government believe in Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE BUDGET

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, six months ago, the Prime Minister promised Canadians that he would get the deficit under control, that he would lower our debt and lower inflation. Instead, he has blown an \$80-billion hole in the budget. The debt is climbing, inflation is climbing, and he has added \$90 billion in new spending. That is over \$5,000 for every family. Every dollar that the Prime Minister spends costs Canadians in higher taxes, higher inflation and more expensive debt.

With this budget, Canadians are paying champagne prices for tap water results, so why is he asking them to pay more?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the previous comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North. This budget is about building this great country, and what this budget shows is that with the trillion dollars of investment

that we are going to catalyze, we are going to put more than \$3,000 in the pocket of every Canadian by the end of this decade.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are not investing in the next generation. They are borrowing from it. The Prime Minister is on track to be the most expensive in Canada's history. The only ones cashing in on it are bankers.

Interest payments on the national debt will cost Canadians \$55 billion this year. That is more than the government spends on health care and more than it collects in GST. Every dollar that Canadians pay in GST does not go to doctors, nurses or hospitals. It goes to bankers.

Why is the Prime Minister so determined to make sure that bankers get better care than patients?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget preserves the health transfer to the provinces, over \$29 billion. This budget puts \$5 billion into health infrastructure. This budget has the lowest net debt-to-GDP in the G7. It has the lowest deficit projected, and the cost of interest borne is lower than when the Conservatives were in government.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this costly Liberal budget will drive up the price of food, housing and everything else Canadians need. The Prime Minister says Canada is in a strong fiscal position. If that is so, why are families struggling to make ends meet? Why is home ownership virtually impossible for young people? Why are 2.2 million Canadians lining up at food banks every month?

This is not a strong position, it is a precarious one. The Liberal leader has chosen to make his friends richer with an \$80-billion deficit.

Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise to spend less by adding fuel to the fire of inflation?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 75% of the new measures in budget 2025 are for protecting Canada's sovereignty and for making life more affordable for Canadians. That is the first point.

The second point is that this is a budget that invests in Canada. It is a budget that builds confidence in Canada. It is a budget that is going to put more than \$3,000 in Canadians' pockets.

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a budget that will make this Liberal Prime Minister go down in history as the most costly head of state Canada has ever seen.

I would like to remind him of something important: Every dollar he spends comes directly out of the pocket of a Canadian who worked hard to earn it. He promised to spend less. His deficit is going to be nearly \$80 billion. It is not for nothing that today's Journal de Montréal said, "The federal government is out of touch with real life".

What parallel universe is the Prime Minister living in? Why can he not understand that increasing inflation with his spending will make life even harder for all Canadians?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not the most costly budget, it is the most ambitious budget for Canada.

It is more ambitious when it comes to housing for Quebecers and housing across the country. It is more ambitious for the ports, for clean energy and for the future of Canada. It is a budget for the future of Canada.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's \$80-billion deficit will cost each Canadian household \$5,400 while avoiding the tax pain he imposes on Canadians. This is coming from the guy who set up \$30 billion in offshore tax havens for Brookfield when he was the chair. He continues to dodge questions on how much he personally has stashed away offshore while avoiding the taxes he imposes on Canadians.

Will the Prime Minister stand up today and tell Canadians how much money he has in offshore tax havens, just the number?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget tightens tax fairness. This budget cuts taxes for 22 million Canadians. This budget cuts taxes on new homes for young Canadians starting out. This budget cuts the carbon tax. This budget grows this great country. The member should come with us and support it.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is avoiding the question like he helped Brookfield avoid taxes. When he imposes higher taxes on Canadians, they have a right to know if the Prime Minister still has money in offshore tax havens. I will give him one more chance.

Will the Prime Minister stand up on his own two feet and tell Canadians exactly how much money he has stashed away in offshore tax havens, just the number?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my record in the private sector, but I am deeply honoured to serve Canadians, and we are serving Canadians by building this great country, by investing in homes, by investing in energy, by investing in ports and by investing in our future. We are going to grow this country like not seen before. There is a chance for everyone in this House to stand up and support it.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

SENIORS

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for a Quebecker, standing up increasingly means wanting Quebec to become independent.

We gave this government, which is in the midst of a recruitment campaign, a chance. We called on the government to eliminate the discrimination in the old age security benefit paid to people aged 65 to 75, who get 10% less than people aged 75 and over. All it had to do was agree that this is indeed a matter of basic justice.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that he refused outright to help retirees?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget includes more than \$80 billion in transfers for seniors across Canada. I repeat, \$80 billion. Yes, the amount is higher for those who are older. That is justice.

* * *

● (1425)

HOUSING

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not read his notes, nor did he read his budget. I will give him a second chance.

Building houses is great. However, young families have to be able to afford them. We have asked the government to create a system that gives young families buying their first house privileged access to credit so that somebody can buy those starter homes. The government refused.

Will the Prime Minister confirm that he refused to give young families access to credit so they can buy their first home?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, there is help for young people buying their first home. That, too, is justice, and we are making big investments in housing. There is also the FHSA.

* * *

HEALTH

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, health is another priority for Quebecers and Canadians. We have offered to work with the government on increasing health transfers to keep pace with higher health care system spending in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada. The government said that the taxpayers of Quebec and Canada would pay more and more income tax or else the governments of Quebec and Canada would have less and less money for other things.

Can the government confirm that it is refusing to increase health transfers to keep pace with health care system spending? That would take some backbone.

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news for Quebec. This budget includes \$12 billion in health transfers and \$5 billion for health infrastructure. There is \$4 billion for Hydro-Québec. There is the port at Contrecoeur, the second wharf in Saguenay and \$500 million for culture, including Quebec cultural institutions.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current government is the most expensive in Canadian history. The Prime Minister does not seem to understand that the more he spends, the more things cost for regular Canadians. Liberals had a chance to lower food costs by scrapping the industrial carbon tax, but they chose to increase food costs by increasing the industrial carbon tax. That drives up input costs of things like 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 Conservatives vote against budget 2025, they vote against old age security, they vote against the guaranteed income supplement, they vote against the New Horizons for Seniors program, they vote against anti-fraud measures that will protect seniors from financial crime, they vote against a tax credit for personal support workers who care for seniors and they vote against the dental care that over two million seniors rely on.

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

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me spell this out for the Liberals: no farms, no food. The food professor warns, “we’re the only country within the G7 which has seen four consecutive months of [rising] food inflation”. The industrial carbon tax is driving up wholesale food prices, full stop.

The Liberals have introduced another of the most costly and largest deficit budgets in Canadian history. When Canadians are already struggling to put food on the table, why is the Prime Minister so intent on increasing the industrial carbon tax to make food more expensive?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will quote Sylvain Charlebois.

He states, “Ottawa has quietly set the stage for some indirect relief—not through grocery subsidies or consumer-facing policies, but through infrastructure, trade, and administrative reforms that could make the food system work a little more efficiently.”

Our farmers have been asking for some of this stuff for a long time. Stand up and give it to them.

The Speaker: Again, comments go through the Chair, please.

• (1430)

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of

Canadians. The more the Liberals spend, the more things cost. Unfortunately, the Liberal Prime Minister did not learn anything from the mistakes of the last Liberal prime minister. The Liberals had a chance in their budget to lower food costs for Canadians by scrapping the industrial carbon tax, yet 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. Eleanor Olszewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 delivers a stronger Alberta economy by backing workers, industries and innovators. It supports jobs and Alberta's economic edge.

Edmonton Chamber of Commerce CEO Doug Griffiths said it is “a clear commitment to driving economic growth and job creation.”

Conservatives cannot stand up for Alberta if they will not listen to our business community.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal industrial carbon tax drives up the price of food. Since the Prime Minister took office, strawberries are up 25%, beef is up 25% and coffee is up 20%. The food professor, Sylvain Charlebois, told us that the widening gap between Canadian and American food prices was driven by one single factor: the carbon tax. He predicts bad news for 2026 and states that we are the only country in the G7 that has seen four consecutive months of a food inflation rate increase.

Why is the Prime Minister insisting on making food more expensive for Canadians by raising—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand today and support a budget that is not only growing this country but also paying attention to rural communities. I can tell members that in Newfoundland and Labrador, investments in roads, bridges, hospitals, houses and communities matter. I ask my Conservative Newfoundland and Labrador colleagues, are they are going to vote for the things that matter to all of the province?

Oral Questions

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pocket of Canadians, and the more they spend, the more things cost. The Liberals just had a chance to lower food prices by scrapping the industrial carbon tax. Instead, they chose to make food more expensive by hiking the industrial carbon tax, which makes food, fuel and farm equipment more expensive. These costs are passed directly on to Canadians at the grocery store.

Why is the Prime Minister not scrapping the carbon tax and making food less expensive?

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives are focused on imaginary taxes, we are building Canada strong. Budget 2025 invests \$51 billion into the build community strong fund. This is good news for families in southwestern Ontario, like the folks that live in the area my colleague represents. This includes money for the new athletic park in Surrey. It includes the Royal Athletic Park in Victoria. It includes the Hamilton downtown YMCA. It includes the sports centre in Montréal-Nord. We are going to build Canada strong, and that includes sports facilities for our communities. I hope that member of Parliament will vote for our budget.

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following is not imaginary: The food professor said, “The gap between wholesale prices in Canada versus the U.S., food wholesale prices, has [widened], and...one factor driving that is the [industrial] carbon tax.”

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Dave Epp: Go ahead, mock.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is the only G7 country that has had four consecutive months of food inflation increases. Farmers, manufacturers and builders across the country are paying more for fertilizer, steel and concrete, costs that end up on Canadians' plates.

While other G7 countries are lowering costs, the Prime Minister is ignoring the experts, increasing the carbon tax and making food more expensive. Why?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the very-often-quoted Sylvain Charlebois had exactly this to say about budget 2025: our investments and logistics and corridors and trade will bring prices down for food. The food professor went on to say, making the national school food program permanent will “make a difference where it counts.” Making that program permanent is exactly what the food professor has called for.

● (1435)

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we now know the government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pocket of Canadians. The more the Liberals spend, the more life costs. Every economist knows this. The Prime Minister could have scrapped the inflationary industrial carbon tax. Instead, he chose to increase the tax and increase costs for all Canadians.

My question for the Prime Minister is simple: Why is he increasing the industrial carbon tax and making our food more expensive?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is what our government is doing: Last week, we worked with nine different countries to announce 25 different transactions to bring \$6.4 billion to six new mining and processing facilities all across this country. Voting for the budget will bring a lot more of that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE BUDGET

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the budget is kind of the worst of both worlds. It is a Liberal deficit with Conservative ideas: nothing for health, nothing for seniors, cuts to the environment. It is Stephen Harper all over again.

I am not the one saying so. The leader of the government said yesterday that this is a budget that Conservative voters can get behind. The Liberals are not even trying to hide it any more.

Quebeckers did not vote Conservative. They did not vote for cuts to health care. They did not vote for abandoning seniors. They did not vote for giving up on the fight against climate change.

Why are the Liberals not responding to what Quebeckers want?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebeckers voted for 44 Quebec MPs to sit on this side of the House.

People may recall who the president of ADISQ was in 2003. It was the leader of the Bloc Québécois. Does anyone know what ADISQ said about our budget? It welcomed the government's budget.

This is the most significant investment in culture in the history of Canada. The leader of the Bloc Québécois is going to tell all his members to vote against investments in culture in Quebec for film, television, music and homegrown artists. He is going to say no to all that. He is going to tell them to stand in the way of all these investments.

* * *

CLIMATE CHANGE

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this budget is the epitome of climate capitulation. The Department of the Environment's budget is being cut by 15%. The emissions cap for the oil and gas sector is being eliminated. Oil companies are getting tax credits. That is just a short list.

Oral Questions

The commissioner of the environment and sustainable development was clear this morning. He confirmed that, even before the budget, Canada was not on track to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets by 2030, and now with the elimination of carbon pricing, we are going backwards. The budget's response is fewer environmental measures and more money for oil companies.

We are headed for disaster. Why are the Liberals stepping on the gas?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I keep repeating again and again, our government will continue to fight climate change.

If we take a closer look at the budget, the impact it will have is obvious. We are going to strengthen industrial carbon pricing, reduce methane emissions and much more. Looking through the pages of the budget, we can clearly see that all government departments will be involved in this fight. We are going to get the job done. We will build a strong country, a strong Canada.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Toronto homebuilding industry released a scathing report on the government's budget, warning of 100,000 job losses in the sector despite the Prime Minister's promising 500,000 new homes a year during the election.

The government continues to refuse to implement our policy of cutting the GST on all new homes under \$1.3 million. Now, housing starts have plummeted and developers are laying off their trained staff because the cost of government is just too high.

Why will the government not listen to the experts and cut the GST on all new homes under \$1.3 million, so builders can get back to work and build the homes Canadians so desperately need?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is the reality check: The Conservative Party of Canada is voting against the largest investment in infrastructure in Canadian history, meaning thousands of jobs and apprenticeship opportunities, opportunities for our youth, opportunities to train the next generation, roads, bridges, community centres, hospitals, major projects in the national interest and homes.

None of this happens if the Conservatives vote against the budget. I hope they will reconsider.

• (1440)

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if spending money could solve the housing crisis, we would have a surplus right now.

This is a government that named a housing minister who made housing taxes 141% more expensive in Vancouver and increased the price of homes by 149%. We are in a housing crisis now, and it is clear this guy does not get it. The experts are warning of 100,000 job losses in this sector.

If the government will not listen to us and to what we are saying about cutting the GST on homes under \$1.3 million, why does it not listen to the experts?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real question is, will the Conservatives support the most aggressive housing budget in Canadian history?

The government is proposing the biggest investment in our history in affordable housing, putting Canadians to work to build the affordable housing we need. We are seeing unprecedented levels of housing starts. We are seeing progress in housing right now, and we are doubling up on that.

We are going to build, and we expect your support on the budget in order to do more.

The Speaker: Again, members need to go through the Chair. I do not have an opinion on this.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Canadians saw the truth about the Liberal government's disastrous housing plan. The Liberals promised to build 500,000 homes a year, but it turned into a plan to kill 100,000 jobs. Toronto's Building Industry and Land Development Association says the budget is "particularly troubling", not an actionable plan to reduce housing fees with any urgency. The Liberals promised to cut development charges by 50% but, surprise, it is another broken Liberal promise. Housing sales have collapsed, down 82% in the GTA.

Will the Prime Minister finally admit that he is not building homes but rather building only a long list of broken promises?

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that will invest in Canada, invest in young Canadians and invest in Canadian families from coast to coast to coast.

We are supporting youth by giving them opportunities to help them build skills in trades and access high-paying careers and jobs across projects, building homes and building out major national projects. We are investing in training and supports for 20,000 youth facing employment barriers, and in 24,000 additional Canada summer jobs opportunities, co-ops, internships and apprenticeships across the country.

We hope the members opposite will support young people and these opportunities for jobs.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have heard the recycled ideas before, and Canada's housing industry continues to fall. Housing sales are down 82% in the GTA. Toronto's BILD association warns that this budget is built on backward-looking data that provides false assurances. In simple terms, builders cannot build, sellers cannot sell and buyers cannot buy. The budget would also cost 100,000 jobs and commit us to a future with fewer homes and fewer opportunities.

Will the Prime Minister come to his senses and finally address the cost of development charges so we can unleash our housing construction?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Conservatives talk about affordability, what they really mean are cuts: cuts to the programs that Canadians vitally rely on.

Parents and families know they can trust that our government has their back. We strengthened the Canada child benefit, providing families nearly \$8,000 for children under six years old and \$6,570 for children aged six to 17. Through the budget, we are making permanent the national school food program, which will give parents the peace of mind of sending their kids to school for a full meal.

What the member was really referring to was that the only thing recycled on the other side of the House is the Conservatives' slogans.

* * *

FINANCE

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes right out of Canadians' pockets. The more he spends, the more everything costs.

The Prime Minister promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but he raised it. He promised to spend less, but he has blown \$90 billion, costing every family \$5,400. Now the Liberals are spending more on interest payments than on health care. They are spending \$55.6 billion to service debt while Canadians struggle to pay for groceries and housing.

When will the Prime Minister stop mortgaging Canadians' future and deliver an affordable budget for Canadians?

• (1445)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has risen in the House many times to address public safety concerns, and I know that his constituents in Brampton have those concerns, because they are my constituents too.

In this budget, there are historic investments. There is \$1.7 billion to the RCMP. We are deploying a thousand new officers and a thousand new CBSA agents. The Conservatives said they are not going to support it, but that does not surprise me, since their leader thinks the RCMP is dispensable.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

HOUSING

Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a former mayor, I am concerned about issues related to aging infrastructure and the housing shortage. This affects not only urban ridings, but also rural ridings like mine, Brome—Missisquoi.

The government has committed to investing in housing and infrastructure as part of the "Canada Strong" budget. This is a once-in-a-generation investment. Can the Minister of Finance and National Revenue tell the House what measures are being taken to build faster and more boldly than ever before in ridings like mine?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have lots of good news for Canadians, but only 30 seconds to explain it.

Yes, with Build Canada Homes, we are going to build more affordable housing. With the community-building fund, we will be able to invest in water systems and municipal infrastructure. We have set up a health infrastructure fund, as Quebec requested.

All members of the House should stand in support of a generational budget. We are going to help future generations and build a strong Canada. We believe in Canada.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister introduced his first budget, much more costly than Canadians had anticipated. A \$78-billion deficit is a high hurdle to get over, but the fiscal year is not final yet, and the government has never set a spending target it has not blown past. Do not worry; there is more debt ahead.

The next five years of forecast deficits have doubled under the Prime Minister, and I will correct the Prime Minister, because 10 years ago under the last Conservative administration, debt servicing was \$28 billion and going down. It is now \$55 billion and going up.

Why is the Prime Minister choosing to ignore the inflation he is causing, and driving up costs for Canadians?

Oral Questions

Hon. Jill McKnight (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a generational budget that will increase Canada's competitiveness and prosperity. That is good news for our small, medium and large business owners. The president and CEO of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Candace Laing, said that "the government has heard business' call to focus on the economy and has made some tough choices to attract investment."

This is about building the strongest economy in the G7. I hope we can count on our colleagues' support.

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that did not answer the question. It was a lot of fantasy, at the end of the day.

The government once again has revised its so-called fiscal anchors. That is another target the Liberals keep missing. That is no problem; they just change the definition. This year's anchors are so weak that they are practically meaningless. When they change a definition to fit their narrative, they undermine trust and accountability. Canadians deserve stability, not a government that moves the goalposts whenever it suits it.

Canada's fiscal position is adrift. Will the minister admit that this budget has no fiscal responsibility and that his so-called anchors are political spin?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government recently announced a three-year extension of Operation Reassurance, Canada's largest overseas military mission, with over 2,000 CAF members stationed in Latvia.

Is the member seriously suggesting that Canada should not pass a budget that would allow us to give the strongest expression of our commitment to NATO as Canadians reinforce NATO's eastern flank by contributing to collective defence and co-operative security in the region? Canada is leading a 14-nation multinational brigade there.

I would suggest that the members opposite join us and support our Canadian Armed Forces.

* * *

● (1450)

CARBON PRICING

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar that the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. The more he spends, the more things cost.

The Prime Minister promised Canadians that he would keep the deficit at less than \$62 billion; instead, it is \$78 billion. He told Canadians that he would get rid of the consumer carbon tax; instead, the industrial carbon tax is set to rise and make food even more expensive by driving up the cost of fuel, fertilizer and farm equipment.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax, and why does he want to make food more expensive?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada

Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a working-class Canadian voting Conservative would be like a chicken voting for Colonel Sanders, my goodness.

When I talk to people who live in rural Nova Scotia, they want simple things. They want good jobs, better health care and lower taxes, and this budget would deliver all three. Members do not have to take my word for it; they can listen to a statement from the provincial Progressive Conservative government in Nova Scotia, which congratulated the Prime Minister on his budget based on more money for health care infrastructure, for housing and development and for tax incentives that will create good jobs for the people who live in my communities.

Conservatives from different parts of the country know this is a good idea. The only Conservatives who disagree seem to be the ones who sit on the other side of the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have tabled the most costly budget with the biggest deficit in Canadian history, outside of the pandemic. The cost of their budget will drive up the cost of food, housing and everything Canadians need. Our families are paying the price at the grocery store for the industrial carbon tax, which the government has increased.

A few weeks ago, I asked the government a question about a woman in La Pocatière, in my riding, who was forced to choose between food and housing. We did not get an answer.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax, which is making food more expensive for my constituent and for all Canadians?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a bit surprised by my colleague opposite's reaction. In this budget, there are jobs at Davie. There are jobs in La Pocatière thanks to the action we are taking.

My riding of Châteauguay—Les Jardins-de-Napierville is home to one of Quebec's longest borders, a feature we share with the ridings of several of my colleagues. In this budget, there is \$1.7 billion to strengthen security at our borders. That is what we are getting with this budget.

If my constituents need it, I am sure that people in other places need it too.

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals had the opportunity to lighten the load on Canadians, but since this Prime Minister came to power, prices have skyrocketed. Strawberries cost 25% more, beef costs 25% more and coffee costs 20% more. It is unbelievable.

The industrial carbon tax is widening the price gap with the United States and will keep food inflation high. These are not my words, but the words of Professor Sylvain Charlebois. He even said that inflation would continue unabated for years to come.

Once again, why is the government increasing this tax and making food even more expensive for our families?

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, building a strong Canada means making generational investments in infrastructure. Budget 2025 includes \$5 billion for a health infrastructure fund that will help build new hospitals, emergency rooms, health care centres and medical schools, to name just a few. That is what the provinces, including Quebec, and the territories asked us for, and that is what we are putting in place.

* * *

TAXATION

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. Conservatives support lowering taxes so Canadians can have more money in their pockets. Do members know where the Liberals decided to cut taxes? I hope they are sitting down for this. They decided to cut taxes on private aircraft and luxury boats. This is not a joke. It is intended for the Liberals' friends.

I encourage members to come to the grocery store with me, talk to single moms and seniors, and tell them that luxury boat owners will be getting a tax cut, not them at the grocery store.

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleague opposite to speak to all of his constituents.

In this budget, we have decided to protect the position of first nations. It is important to note that we have also included investments in infrastructure, such as clean drinking water and housing. I encourage the opposition to work with us to protect these decisions, to protect indigenous nations. I know my colleague has indigenous communities in his riding.

• (1455)

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, Pierre-Olivier Zappa, who is a leader in economics and finance, wrote an article about how the federal government is out of touch with reality. The minister is talking about the first nations when I am asking about luxury boats and planes. I do not understand her answer.

Who decided to lower taxes on private jets and luxury yachts while our constituents are suffering and struggling? There is nothing for our seniors, nothing for our people. Who made that decision?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it fascinating when an MP from Quebec stands up and says that Quebec's aerospace industry is not important. Thanks to the government's decision, yesterday, Bombardier announced that it would be creating 600 new jobs in Quebec.

Oral Questions

As a former colleague of François Legault at the National Assembly of Quebec, my colleague should call the premier of Quebec and tell him that he is against 600 new jobs in Mirabel.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a democracy, everything can be debated, but some moral lines should never be blurred; protecting vulnerable children must remain one of them.

The Supreme Court recently struck down a one-year mandatory prison sentence for two men who possessed hundreds of sexual images of children, some as young as three years old. These are real victims of abuse and trauma.

Why is the government more focused on protecting the charter rights of pedophiles than on defending the dignity of children?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, child abusers should face the toughest penalties under Canadian law.

We are bringing forward legislation that would protect children. I hope the Conservatives can support it. Their past record is that they have not supported the online harms legislation and have not supported lawful access tools for law enforcement so we can catch child predators. They put politics before the safety of our children.

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the sexual exploitation of children is one of the clearest and most horrific crimes imaginable. Recently the Supreme Court struck down the one-year mandatory sentence for possessing child sexual abuse material, yet the government refuses to use section 33 of the charter, the notwithstanding clause, to restore the minimal penalties for pedophiles.

Why is the government choosing to protect the charter rights of predators over the safety and the innocence of our children?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, child predators are the worst criminals in our country, and they should face the toughest sentences. That is exactly why we are bringing forward new legislation to toughen sentences and make sure child predators stay behind bars.

I would like the Conservatives to promise that they will support that piece of legislation and Bill C-19, which is currently before this House, because they have not supported us in the past when it comes to helping and protecting children.

Please put your politics aside and support the children of this country.

The Speaker: Members should go through the Chair, please.

The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

*Oral Questions***TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

Alana Hirtle (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 is a generational investment in our economy, in our industries and in Canadians. Canadians are paying lower prices for cellular services, with a 40% decline in prices over five years, but these bills still eat into the pockets of Canadians. Budget 2025 has proposed measures to lower costs for Canadians and improve competition.

At a time when Canadians are concerned with rising costs and keeping their monthly bills affordable, can the Minister of Industry tell us how the government is working to lower cellphone bills?

• (1500)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Cumberland—Colchester and I, and this government, are laser-focused on making sure that we bring down costs in the telecom sector. We took the right decision this summer to uphold the decision of the CRTC to increase competition in the telecommunications sector. We also said we would be hawkish on competition.

We will do more in this budget to increase competition and make sure that we reform our telecommunications sector.

* * *

FINANCE

Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have introduced the most costly and largest budget deficit in history outside of COVID. The cost of the Liberal budget will drive up the cost of food, housing and everything else Canadians buy.

Young families, seniors and veterans in Edmonton Northwest are having to make hard choices as the snow falls. It is costing more to heat their homes and feed their families, but every day in this House, the Liberals say families are just imagining higher living expenses while their taxes and spending increase.

Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise to spend less and is pouring more inflationary fuel on the fire?

Hon. Stephen Fuhr (Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 would enable Canada to step up to meet the moment by including \$82 billion for defence and security.

Here is a fun fact. Stephen Harper's 2009 budget, adjusted for inflation, is actually the biggest deficit budget in Canadian history, with little to show for it. We will take no lessons from the Conservatives.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is adjusted for the inflation that they caused.

The Liberals' new budget is generationally expensive. It is historically expensive. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends will come out of Canadians' pockets. The more Liberals spend, the more things will cost. Through either taxes or inflation in the future, the costs will come.

Eighty billion dollars is \$2,000 for each man, woman and child in our country. That is \$2,000 for my three-year-old daughter and \$2,000 for my one-year-old son. Why should they have to pay this generational debt the Prime Minister is saddling us with? Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise to spend less?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget invests in lowering the cost of living and creating jobs, including with \$2 billion for the critical minerals sovereign fund. Critical minerals are in our phones, computers, solar panels, medical equipment and more. Canada is rich in minerals, with projects in ridings held by Conservatives, the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and Liberals, including in my home, the Northwest Territories. These investments mean good jobs, including in Ontario, and stronger communities and will keep Canada a leader in technology, defence and health care.

The Mining Association of Canada has applauded the budget, and I hope members opposite will too.

Colin Reynolds (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. The more the Liberals spend, the more things cost.

The nearly \$80 billion in deficit spending means that \$450 a month is coming right out of Canadians' pockets. This will make it even harder for Canadians to buy groceries and pay their bills. Instead, we get a bloated bureaucracy and high-priced consultants.

Why does the Prime Minister believe he can spend hard-working Canadians' money better than they can?

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are focused on securing our sovereignty in the north and the Arctic, with a \$1-billion infrastructure fund for airports, seaports and all-season roads in the north and in northern Manitoba. We are focused on \$2.3 billion for clean water in indigenous communities.

The Conservatives are voting against having an Inuit Nunangat university to build skills and hopes for northern youth. We are focused on building, protecting and empowering Canadians. They need to get on board.

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, residents in my riding have expressed concerns about the cost of living. Budget 2025 is full of great initiatives that will empower them and Canadians across the country—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Clearly, there are many in the House who would like to hear the member from the top.

The hon. member for Honoré-Mercier.

• (1505)

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are very excited to hear me today.

Budget 2025 is full of great initiatives that will empower Canadians across the country to get ahead financially. Increasing competition is one way to achieve affordability, and in budget 2025, there are several pro-affordability measures related to making the financial sector more competitive.

Could the Secretary of State for CRA and Financial Institutions inform the House about how the government is making life more affordable for Canadians by reforming the financial sector?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in our generational budget, Canada's new government is making life more affordable for Canadians by making our financial system more competitive and innovative. Among other things, we are providing Canadians with more financial options by helping credit unions and smaller banks grow and compete and by advancing open banking, which will make it easier for Canadians to find lower-fee chequing accounts, cheaper loans and higher-interest savings.

On this side of the House, we are laser-focused on making life more affordable for Canadians.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told Canadians that they need to sacrifice more to pay for the Liberals' inflationary deficit, but the Liberals sure are not sacrificing much. Yesterday, an Ottawa gossip rag feted the Liberals for attending a lavish deficit cocktail party hosted by rich Ottawa insiders, lobbyists and media firms, who were thrilled with the billions of tax dollars for their wealthy clients and owners.

Will the Liberals apologize for popping champagne corks with rich lobbyists to celebrate a massive inflationary deficit while Canadians cannot even afford a case of beer?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that rural Canada wants the investment the budget affords. It is all that Canada needs.

We are going stand to support rural Canada. In Saskatchewan, I want to tell our MPs and Conservative MPs that Saskatchewan is watching.

All we are asking those guys to do is what they have been doing for the last 10 years on the budget vote, which is to sit this one out so that Saskatchewan can finally get help for the province to reach its full potential. Come on board.

Oral Questions

THE BUDGET

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there was much hype about the budget. Much had already been made public in the pre-budget announcements. My question is about what is not in the budget.

The impact of the 15% cut across most departments, including the loss of 40,000 workers, is buried in buzzwords like “streamlining”, “modernizing” and “recalibrating”. Will the Prime Minister tell Canadians what programs are being cut, which ones will end when the funding sunsets and how people in our communities will be impacted? Canadians deserve to know.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague saw in the budget that we were true to our values, Canadian values. We made sure that, while we did a budget focused on the future and investment, we protected people, child care, pharmacare and dental care. We understand on this side of the House that affordability and supporting Canadians at a time like this are essential.

At the same time as we are going to build a great future, we are going to take care of Canadians today, because we believe in Canada.

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly clear that the government's budget fails to deliver the transformational change promised and fails to meet the moment. It fails to provide any relief right now to the millions of Canadians suffering through an affordability crisis. Sixty per cent are having trouble meeting their monthly expenses. Half are using credit cards or borrowing money for daily needs, paying interest rates of 19% or more.

Why did the Liberals fail to provide concrete measures to help the millions of Canadians who need help now?

• (1510)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague will remember that the first thing we did for Canadians was cut taxes for 22 million Canadians because we understood that affordability is at the heart of the concerns of Canadians. More than that, I am sure he saw in the budget an initiative that I know he supports, because we talked about it when we made benefits automatic for Canadians.

That is the way we want to do things. We want to cut red tape, support Canadians and build a great country together.

*Speaker's Ruling***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is time for everyone's favourite moment of the parliamentary week, the Thursday question. I am hoping the government can update the House as to the business of the chamber for the rest of this week and the week after the break week.

While I am on my feet, as this is the Thursday before Remembrance Day, I want to thank all our men and women who currently serve in uniform, all those who have ever donned the Canadian uniform with the Canadian flag on their arm, and all those who have put themselves in harm's way to defend and protect Canada and our allies. We cannot thank veterans and current members of the armed forces enough for what they do.

I hope all Canadians take a moment on November 11 to thank a veteran and to commemorate their service.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to join my hon. friend in saluting our country's veterans, their families and their communities, and all of those we take a moment to remember on November 11. I know all of those people deeply appreciate the support that Canadians demonstrate in their communities on Remembrance Day. I want to join my friend, the opposition House leader, in sending along those wishes.

I want to thank members for an eventful budget week. We are looking forward, of course, to continuing debate on the budget today.

[*Translation*]

The vote on the Conservative Party subamendment will take place later today. We will resume debate on the budget tomorrow, as well as on the Monday after we return from spending the week of Remembrance Day in our ridings.

On Tuesday, Bill C-14, the bail and sentencing reform act, will be debated again at the second reading stage.

On Wednesday, we will move to the report stage and third reading of Bill C-4, an act respecting certain affordability measures for Canadians and another measure.

[*English*]

I must express a little puzzlement. We called Bill C-4 for debate on Monday afternoon. I know the Conservatives are not against taking the GST off of homes for first-time homebuyers. I know they are not against the income tax cut, and I know they are not against removing the carbon tax for Canadians. I am pretty confident about all of those things, so I know they will want to co-operate in advancing this very important piece of legislation on Wednesday.

I wish all members a good week of work in their constituencies as they ponder that final vote on this year's budget, which, as we saw today in question period, contains multitudes for so many Canadians who are looking for a hand up and a way forward.

• (1515)

PRIVILEGE

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on October 24 by the member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes concerning the approval process for forms relating to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons.

In raising his question of privilege, the member alleged that several forms posted on the Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner's website, including those members use to report gifts, benefits and sponsored travel, had been modified without the necessary approval from the House. He pointed out that these documents must be submitted to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and then adopted by the House, in accordance with section 30 of the code.

The member further stated that these unauthorized changes constituted a contempt of the House, and asked that the matter be ruled a *prima facie* case of privilege and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

[*Translation*]

In response, the deputy House leader of the government stated that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs is already considering the matter and it would be premature for the Chair to review it until the committee has reported its findings.

It is true that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs plays a key role in issues pertaining to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons, which can be found in Appendix I to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. Standing Order 108(3)(a)(viii) provides that the committee's mandate includes:

the review of and report on all matters relating to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons.

In addition, section 30(1) of the code, which the House adopted on June 11, 2007, provides as follows:

The commissioner shall submit any proposed procedural and interpretative guidelines and all forms relating to the code to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs for approval.

(2) Any guidelines and forms approved by the committee shall be reported to the House and shall come into effect when the report is concurred in by the House.

(3) Until the guidelines and forms are reported to the House, they shall remain confidential.

*The Budget**[English]*

In the time since the question of privilege was raised in the House, the commissioner has admitted, in a letter to the Speaker dated October 28, that he made a mistake. The commissioner wrote that he wrongly assumed that the committee's approval was not needed because the changes were, in his view, minor. He said that the forms in question have since been removed from his website. The commissioner also acknowledged that, under section 30 of Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons, all forms and guidelines must be submitted to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs for approval before being made public and must remain confidential until they are approved. He further stated that he has subsequently submitted the new documents to the committee for approval.

It is unfortunate that this matter had to be raised in the House, but in light of the explanations provided by the commissioner, there no longer appears to be any doubt about the meaning of section 30 of the code or the need for the commissioner to have any changes to the forms approved by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and by the House itself.

Furthermore, as noted earlier, the Standing Orders already mandate the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to consider issues relating to the code. The Chair is convinced that the committee will follow up on this matter as it sees fit, as evidenced by the meeting it held with the commissioner about the forms on October 30.

Taking into account the explanations and apology the commissioner has offered and the committee's ongoing study of matters pertaining to the code, the Chair, given the circumstances, considers the matter closed.

I thank all members for their attention.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1520)

[English]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government, of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we would also increase the Canada mortgage bond annual issuance limit from \$60 billion to \$80 billion, starting in 2026, unlocking thousands of new housing units every year and helping to finance large multi-unit projects. To help first-time homebuyers take the first step, budget 2025 introduces the first-time homebuyers GST tax credit, which would eliminate the GST on new homes priced under \$1 million and reduce it on homes up to \$1.5 million. This is about restoring the dream of home ownership, about making sure that young people in Pickering—Brooklin do not have to leave the communities they love, to afford a place to live. I am proud to say that budget 2025 would deliver exactly that.

Affordability is about more than mortgages and rent. It is about everyday life, including the grocery bill, the hydro bill and the cost of getting to work. Canadians want to know that when they work hard, they can get ahead, and budget 2025 answers that call. To support young Canadians entering the workforce, the government would invest \$1.5 billion over three years, starting in 2026, to strengthen youth jobs programs such as Canada summer jobs, the youth employment and skills strategy and the student work placement program, which would reach roughly 175,000 young people in 2026-27 alone.

We are also ensuring that no Canadian is left behind. Budget 2025 would invest \$115.7 million over four years to make it easier to access the Canada disability benefit, including a one-time supplemental payment of \$150 for each disability tax credit certification or recertification, while reaffirming that the benefit would be exempt from income calculations under the Income Tax Act.

For millions of Canadians living on low or modest incomes, automatic federal benefits would make it easier to get the support they deserve. By 2028, the CRA would automatically file taxes for 5.5 million low-income Canadians, ensuring they receive benefits such as the GST and HST credits and the Canada child benefit, which they so rightly deserve. Finally, upcoming legislation would make the national school food program permanent, providing \$216.6 million per year to ensure that every child can learn without having to think about their next meal.

These measures are not abstract line items. They are about peace of mind and dignity. They are about making sure that every parent, student and senior in Pickering—Brooklin feels that their government is standing up with them. I am proud to say that the government would deliver on these exact promises.

As we talk about homes and affordability, we cannot forget what makes communities thrive: the infrastructure that connects us, supports us and defines us. From a shortage of needed electrical power supply or high-speed Internet in communities such as Ashburn and Claremont to necessary road safety enhancements for the burgeoning growth of Pickering and even a much-needed new hospital to serve Brooklin residents, these are all necessary infrastructure projects that the community of Pickering—Brooklin requires to safely and effectively house the exponential growth of this region in the coming decades. Budget 2025 would deliver exactly that: a nation-building investment in infrastructure through the new build communities strong fund, a \$51-billion investment over 10 years, with an ongoing annual investment of \$3 billion to help local governments plan, build and grow sustainably.

The Budget

This fund would include three major streams: a community stream, which would provide \$27.8 billion over 10 years and \$3 billion per year ongoing to support local projects; a direct delivery stream, with \$6 billion over 10 years for large-scale retrofits, regional projects, climate adaptation and critical community infrastructure; and a provincial and territorial stream with \$17.2 billion over 10 years for housing-enabling projects, including things like roads, water and waste-water systems, hospitals and post-secondary infrastructure. Within that, \$5 billion over three years would establish a dedicated health infrastructure fund, ensuring our hospitals and care facilities could meet the needs of Canadians.

• (1525)

Infrastructure is not simply concrete and steel or brick and mortar; it is the foundation of opportunity. For Pickering—Brooklin, it is about ensuring that as we grow, we grow well, with strong roads, sustainable water systems, accessible health care, and spaces that bring people together.

No plan for Canada's future is complete without supporting the small businesses that power our local economies. From the machine and tool businesses like Toromont Cat to a visit to Sugamaze for our delectable sweets, or to the tech entrepreneurs setting up in downtown Pickering, small businesses are the lifeline of our community. They create jobs, sponsor local teams and drive Canadian innovation. Budget 2025 recognizes our economic strength depends on their success, and it will deliver exactly what they need to thrive as we build Canada strong.

We are creating an environment that rewards investment and innovation, especially in the industries of the future. The government is introducing and enshrining in law a suite of investment tax credits to give Canadian businesses the confidence to invest: the clean-electricity tax credit, which is soon to be legislated and will be retroactive to March 2023; the clean-technology tax credit, which is now law, providing a 30% incentive for businesses investing in clean innovation and which is also retroactive to March 2023; and the clean-technology manufacturing tax credit, offering a 30% incentive retroactive to January 2024.

We are also strengthening industrial carbon pricing by developing a post-2030 trajectory that gives businesses long-term certainty to plan and invest responsibly.

These measures are not only about clean growth; they are also about empowering Canadian businesses, large and small, to compete and thrive in a low-carbon global economy. For small businesses in Pickering—Brooklin, this means more support to expand, hire and lead in a world that is moving toward sustainable growth.

Canada's new government is investing in our local economy and in Canadians. We will spend less on government operations so we can invest more in growing our economy and protecting the essential programs that make life more affordable.

In the face of uncertainty, Canadians are going to build the future we want for ourselves. Budget 2025 is our plan to do just that: to build, to protect and to empower Canadians. This is our moment, our time to make generational investments to secure Canada's place as a leader among nations.

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is yet another Liberal budget that adds billions in inflationary spending while not growing our economy at all. Our health care system is crumbling, our immigration system is broken and the cost of living is impossible for so many Canadians. Today, young people are struggling to find work, and seniors cannot live off their pension.

Does the member believe it is fair to punish our seniors, who have worked so hard all their life, with more skyrocketing inflationary debt?

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this budget clearly protects our seniors. There is the new horizons funding, for example, which takes a lot of seniors out of isolation. I am grateful the program did not get cut. We are investing in the gains and benefits seniors are receiving right now. I want to assure the member opposite that seniors are very well taken care of in the 2025 budget.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. I would like to pick up on what the Conservative member who spoke before me asked her.

Frankly, it is insulting. This budget is an insult to seniors. The New Horizons for Seniors program was renewed, as is only right, but there is not a penny more. It is great that there will be activities to help seniors feel less isolated, but they will not have enough money to go anywhere. Seriously, the only thing people aged 65 to 74 want the government to do is correct the unacceptable unfairness that emerged when it created two classes of seniors. Poverty does not wait until people turn 75; nor does illness.

Why is the government bent on maintaining two classes of seniors and subjecting those aged 65 to 74 to financial insecurity?

[*English*]

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the new horizons program because I worked with seniors in my past life for many years, and I understand that the program takes seniors out of isolation. I am very passionate about it.

My colleague referred to a two-class system. I think that as seniors age, their needs also increase. The government has recognized that, hence the two-tiered system. I think it is needed.

The Budget

As we are able to earn more and build Canada strong, we will bring more programs to seniors in the future.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over 52,000 Canadians have died from poisoned drug supply. Canada has the third-highest per capita rate of any country in the world; only the United States and Puerto Rico have a higher death rate per capita, yet in this budget, there is zero mention of the toxic drug crisis and an action plan to deal with it. The government has created a drug strategy that says that it is going to take a compassionate, integrated approach. Still, there is no timeline, plan or money, so that plan is useless.

When is the government going to take the toxic drug crisis seriously, or is it just going to continue the stigma it is implementing in responding to this terrible crisis?

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is a crisis, and I do empathize.

I want to reiterate that, for some programs, health is under the jurisdiction of the provinces, and they need to pay closer attention to some of the crises happening in our communities.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague could go a bit further and tell us what parts of the budget speak to her community.

There is so much stuff in this budget that will respond to every riding represented across the House, but I want to hear from my colleague what from the budget she will tell her residents.

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly in support of and very thrilled about the programs and the money allocated for youth: \$1.5 billion over three years, starting next year, to strengthen youth jobs programs, like Canada summer jobs, which is a 30% increase from last year; the youth employment and skills strategy to get youth ready for jobs; and the student work placement program, reaching roughly 20,000 youth. These are—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saint John—St. Croix.

John Williamson (Saint John—St. Croix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt.

I rise on behalf of the lobster fishermen and fisherwomen in Charlotte County, working families in Saint John West, the truck drivers driving our highways, the pensioners throughout New Brunswick Southwest and every small business owner hanging on for help. These Canadians look to Parliament and wonder if the people entrusted to govern understand the difficulties families and pensioners face every single day.

They are fed up with the government because it printed money and devalued family savings while driving up prices, especially home prices. They are exhausted because they are working harder and falling further behind. They are tired of a federal government that costs us too much, taxes too much and delivers too little year after year. They are dumbfounded by being told to tighten their belt and to sacrifice more after years of sacrifices, while the federal government adds another \$78 billion to our debt this year alone. That works out to \$5,400 more debt for each Canadian household.

My constituents are the people who pay the bills of the government, as well as the bone-crushing debt on government spending. They work hard and follow the rules, and in return they seek the dignity of keeping what they earn and the opportunity to build a financially secure life in safe communities.

Households in my riding are not asking for more government bureaucrats to manage the economy; they are asking for a government that respects the value of a paycheque and spends their money wisely. They are crying out for change.

When the Prime Minister entered office, he promised fiscal discipline. He promised a steady hand to make things better. Some of my constituents even believed that the Liberals would not be more of the same after the last federal election, yet it is obvious from the budget those hopes have been dashed.

The Liberals, under so-called new leadership, have nearly doubled the \$42-billion deficit forecast by Justin Trudeau. We can now all see that the new boss is just like the old boss but even more expensive. Today's \$78-billion deficit is the largest in Canadian history outside war or the pandemic. It is the most expensive government in Canadian history, and Canadians have never received less from it.

Our nation is on the wrong path. The Prime Minister is adding \$10 million in debt every hour and placing the burden of today's spending on the backs of our children, our grandchildren and even our great-grandchildren. Canadians want the next generation to inherit a Canada where hard work is rewarded and where one can build a life, afford a home and have confidence in the future. The reality is that after a Liberal decade of lost opportunity, Canada is a less prosperous nation, less safe and more costly. It is a place where the dream of home ownership is now an impossible, costly nightmare.

Many people remember or understand from recent history what happens when government spends wildly beyond its means: Before we hit the fiscal wall, economic growth falls, families struggle and life becomes harder. This budget keeps Canada barrelling down Justin Trudeau's road to debt-fuelled economic ruin. It is the road to serfdom.

The national debt now stands at almost \$1.35 trillion. What do Canadians receive from this vast sum, impossible to understand because it is so large? Do we have more doctors and nurses in our hospitals, more homes being built, more affordable food or stronger paycheques? No, there is none of this, yet a newborn in Canada now begins life with a \$32,000 debt, thanks to the Liberals.

The Budget

The Government of Canada is now drowning in red ink and will spend \$55 billion on debt interest payments every single year. What is astonishing is that this amount is more than what Ottawa transfers to the provinces for health care every single year. It is also more than what Ottawa collects in GST revenue each year. This means that every dollar Canadians pay in GST to Ottawa now goes to bankers and bondholders instead of to social programs and federal programs. This is the direct cost of Liberal recklessness; GST revenue goes entirely to fund debt, not to social programs or to the government to help Canadians get ahead.

• (1535)

Meanwhile, food prices continue to rise thanks to failing Liberal policies. For example, spending \$800 million, and likely double that amount, on a useless gun confiscation program that targets law-abiding firearm owners is a priority. Here is an idea: If the government were to eliminate this program outright, it would cut the federal deficit this year by 1%. We need 99 other ideas to get rid of this deficit altogether. There is one. If Brookfield paid its taxes, there would be a few more billion dollars. We can eliminate the deficit if we are smart about it.

The gun-grab program is just one example of misplaced Liberal priorities at a time when families that earn two paycheques are skipping meals; seniors are choosing between heating, eating and buying medicine; 2.2 million Canadians use a food bank monthly; and one in five people using a food bank work full time but still cannot afford basic groceries. This is the Canada today under Liberal management. It is time for a change.

Young Canadians who should be building their lives are instead delaying marriage, delaying children, delaying home ownership and delaying their futures. It is not because they lack effort or ambition but because they no longer see a path forward in their own country. The Liberal solution to this self-created mess, and the Liberal answer to every question, is always more government, more red tape and more debt.

Canada can choose another path, a path that builds and rewards work, a path that makes home ownership achievable again and a path where the government lives within its means so families can live within theirs. This is the promise Conservatives are offering. This is why Conservatives moved an amendment to this budget, to fix its flaws, to get Canada's fiscal house in order and to move Canada ahead, finally, after 10 years.

Now is not the time to try to repeat what has already failed and will fail again. We are a country rich in resources, talent and possibility. We cannot continue down a path where the government buries us deeper in debt as Canadians grow poorer. This is why I cannot support the budget as it stands today. It is why Conservatives will not support this budget. It is why the Conservatives will continue working to restore the promise of this country for families who work hard, play by the rules and simply want a fair chance. That will not happen with this budget. It has never happened and will never happen under 10 years of Liberal rule, and that is why we need change.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from New Brunswick for his speech. I am sure he cares as much as I do about economic development in our beautiful province. New Brunswick has 21 of the 34 minerals that Canada has identified as critical. Budget 2025 provides for a \$2-billion investment over five years to set up the critical minerals infrastructure fund, which will make it possible to invest in businesses' projects related to those critical minerals.

Does my colleague share my opinion that this is excellent news with a lot of potential for our province?

John Williamson: Mr. Speaker, for a long time, I have been telling Parliament that we need to take advantage of our natural resources. Right now, the Government of New Brunswick, under the provincial Liberals, is asking this government to do something to move these very important projects forward. So far, nothing has been done.

Yes, it is time to do something for our province, because so far, the Prime Minister has turned down all projects coming from New Brunswick.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, another major disappointment is the issue of health and health transfers, which was largely overlooked in this budget. The government boasts about having invested in hospital infrastructure.

This week, I met with health care representatives after the budget was tabled. They told me that it is good to build hospitals, but if the government does not transfer the necessary funding to pay for health care staff, to pay for research and to approve drugs, this is just a broken promise.

What does my colleague have to say to these health care representatives? It is great to focus on hospitals, but they also need to be staffed and taken care of.

John Williamson: Mr. Speaker, to govern Canada, choices have to be made. I completely agree with my colleague.

Under the former Conservative government of Stephen Harper, health transfers increased every year. Health was always a priority to the Conservatives, but that meant making cuts to spending items that were not a priority. That is something that we know how to do, but the Liberals do not. That is why we need a change for the better.

The Budget

• (1545)

[English]

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal budget proves that the Prime Minister is just the same, if not worse, than Justin Trudeau, adding more government bloat with another \$321.7 billion to the federal debt over the next five years.

How can Canadians trust anything the Liberal government is doing with their hard-earned tax dollars?

John Williamson: Mr. Speaker, we can trust it will do more of the same, and that record is going to be a record of failure.

I had hope the other day when the finance minister tabled his budget and looked up to the gallery, and we saw Mr. Chrétien. Thirty years ago, the Liberals had a problem with too much debt, too much spending and slow growth. What did they do? They went through an expenditure review and cut needless, wasteful duplicate spending. They balanced the budget in three years, and guess what happened. It turbocharged the Canadian economy. That is what this country needs to do again.

Instead, under the current Prime Minister, we are seeing the exact same playbook as the last prime minister, Justin Trudeau. We have had 10 years of slow, anemic growth. We need to turn it around. That will happen by getting our fiscal house in order, lowering taxes and getting out of the way so the private sector will build the homes and create the jobs that pay the paycheques that will get this country moving again.

[Translation]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that our debt-to-GDP ratio is the lowest in the G7, which gives us room for sound management and for investment.

Is my colleague in favour of the “productivity superdeduction,” a set of enhanced tax incentives covering all new capital investment that allows businesses to write off a larger share of the cost of these investments right away so they can contribute to a strong economy?

[English]

John Williamson: Mr. Speaker, I believe in tax cuts any time, anywhere, for Canadians, but I do not just believe in tax cuts for businesses. This budget is a failure because it fails to deal with the affordability crisis that is hurting working families, young families and pensioners. It is all well and good to talk about the debt-to-GDP ratio, which the government has broken. For the last 10 years, it promised to keep lowering it, and in fact, this budget sends it up, breaking another of the Prime Minister's promises.

Yes, I support tax relief to make sure this country is competitive, but I also want to ensure the federal government is doing something to bring down the costs for families. It has not done it, and that is why this budget is a failure.

Jim Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say I am pleased to rise in this House to comment on the Liberal budget, but unfortunately, I cannot. As the newly elected member for Sudbury East—Manitoulin—

Nickel Belt, I have to sadly say that the Liberal budget does almost nothing to address the concerns of the thousands of people I spoke to while campaigning during the election.

As I travelled from community to community during the election campaign, the message was consistent and clear: Life has become less and less affordable. The very necessities of basic life, such as food, housing and energy, have been increasing well beyond the ability of average working-class people to make ends meet. They understood that the last 10 years of Liberal policies were a very large part of the cost of living rising so fast.

From where I am standing, it looks like the government is still driving down the same reckless road it has been on for the past 10 years. Let us think about it. They plan to spend \$321 billion over the next five years, and that is on top of the \$1.3 trillion of federal debt we already have in this country. Who is going to pick up that tab? It will not be us. It will be our kids and grandkids who will be left paying the interest on the massive debt we have accumulated.

[Translation]

As I read the budget, I could not help but think of my grandsons. They do not even know it yet, but they each owe more than \$30,000 as their share of Canada's national debt, all because of the Liberals' irresponsible spending.

Nothing in this budget will help lower the cost of living for northerners. In fact, it will only make things worse.

During the election campaign just six months ago, the Prime Minister made a lot of promises. In my view, he has broken them all. He promised to keep the deficit below \$62 billion. This week's budget indicates that the deficit will be \$78 billion this year and that his tax plan will add another \$321 billion to our debt over the next five years.

• (1550)

[English]

It was not all that long ago the former finance minister, the member for University—Rosedale, resigned as the minister of finance because the former prime minister blew past the Liberals' own self-imposed \$40-billion deficit cap to \$62 billion. It makes me wonder if the Liberals across the aisle have forgotten the words of that very same minister, who called for a little fiscal discipline and warned against throwing money at costly political gimmicks.

Let us put this in perspective. In 2025 and 2026, the interest payments on our national debt will be \$55.6 billion. This is more than the entire amount of money the Government of Canada sends to the provinces for health care. If one is waiting on a list for an MRI, a hip or knee replacement, or any other medical procedure that would improve their quality of life, the Liberal budget does nothing for them or their family's health.

The Budget

The total amount of money spent by the Canadian federal government is projected to be \$538 billion for the 2024-25 fiscal year. These costs have been caused by the last decade of out-of-control Liberal spending, which has created inflationary pressures, driving the cost of everything through the roof. One would think that when the government spends \$538 billion, there would be investments for our seniors to help with the ever-rising costs of food and housing, and money to address addiction, mental health and homelessness.

I had reserved hope that this budget would contain measures to unlock the vast wealth and prosperity right under our feet in northern Ontario with the Ring of Fire. Opening this area to exploration has been a major priority for northern Ontario. The Ring of Fire is not even listed on the major projects list for consideration. There is only a vague mention that hopefully sometime in the next two years the government will encourage companies to invest in the Ring of Fire. While many other projects will be funded by federal dollars, we are left to wonder when we can start to explore and generate prosperity for the people in northern Ontario.

My great-grandparents, Joe and Azilda Bélanger, packed up and left Saint-André-Avellin, Quebec, back in 1886 looking for a better life in Ontario. They worked the land from sun-up to sundown just to scrape by. My grandfather followed in their footsteps, keeping up with the farm and operating his very own logging camps in the winter.

My dad followed the example of my grandfather and became an entrepreneur. He wore many hats throughout his life. He worked in the forestry industry and in construction, and later ran his own grocery store and then a hotel he owned, all while farming the same land Joe and Azilda farmed back in 1886. He did all this with just a grade 4 education. That is what I like to call real northern Ontario grit.

As for me, I was fortunate enough to get a university education, work in the corporate world and eventually run my very own small business. Now I have the privilege of serving as a member of Parliament. My kids and their generation are better educated than those before them and work just as hard, yet they struggle. That keeps me up at night. For the first time in our history, this generation might end up worse off than the one before, and that is what motivated me to run for office.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

For 10 years, uncontrolled spending, high taxes, inflation and bad natural resource policies have made life more difficult. This is not the Canada I grew up in, nor is it the Canada I want for my grandchildren. The Liberals talk about the future and hope, but their actions never produce results that would make life more affordable for Canadians.

[*English*]

The Minister of Finance said that our GDP is too weak and that the Liberals are going to fix it, because they believe in Canada. He said they are going to do this and do that, that we are going to be the best in the G7 and that the Liberals are going to bet big on Canada.

I believe in Canada, but what I do not believe in is betting big on this Liberal budget. It is a very risky proposition. What we have seen in the last 10 years is a lot of promises. Liberals are big on talk, with little action and few results.

I hope my friends across the aisle will take a look at where we are headed. Canada's fiscal situation is not sustainable. I am asking them to accept the amendments we will be putting forward to make life more affordable for all Canadians, if not for their sake, for the sake of the next generation of Canadians, the sons, daughters, nieces and nephews, the young folks who deserve a fair shot at living the Canadian dream, just as we did. Let us not saddle them with debt and broken promises.

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised that my colleague failed to understand, from the budget, that we did everything right to lower the cost of living: We cut taxes for 22 million middle-class Canadians, cancelled the consumer carbon tax, made the national school food program permanent, made federal benefits automatic, increased competition and reduced telecommunications costs. There are many other cost-of-living measures I could name.

All the families in Thérèse-De Blainville clearly understood that and said that it matters to them.

Is my colleague going to promote that in his riding?

Jim Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, that is not even close to what I see in the budget. What I see is money promised for future things. The Liberals are not doing anything for people today. They are clearly out of touch with reality.

This budget is going to make things worse. There is no help coming right now. Some help may come in the future, but the future is too late. People need help today.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on a subject that is of great concern to me as the member for the Gaspé region and the Magdalen Islands and the Bloc Québécois critic for fisheries and oceans. I know members of the Conservative caucus are also concerned about this.

The Budget

There are a number of things missing from the budget, which fails to respond to a number of crises. In particular, the fisheries fund has not been renewed despite being of paramount strategic importance to Quebec, among others. With additional support from the Quebec government, this fund finances projects that promote innovation and scientific research. One example of the work made possible through this fund are the scientific tests conducted to better define the start of the lobster fishing season. Another project involved installing fishing gear that allows right whales to pass through, rather than getting trapped. The fishing gear allows them to pass through.

What does my colleague think of the Liberals' oversight or unwillingness to renew the fisheries fund for Quebec and for the Atlantic provinces?

• (1600)

Jim Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to apologize to my colleague and admit that I am not very familiar with fisheries and things like that. What I do see in the budget, however, is that certain things keep being promised without many details.

[*English*]

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals keep referring to the spending in the Liberal budget as investment. When I was a financial adviser, I was taught that investment is something we give away in the hopes that we get back not only the principal but a substantial amount of money with it.

I am wondering, for the gun grab, whether my colleague thinks “investment” is an appropriate word. We are putting out millions of dollars, but what exactly are we expecting in return? Would the member call that spending or investment?

Jim Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, for sure, I would call that spending. It is more debt.

This gun grab is something that in my area people cannot get over. We are trying to take guns away from law-abiding citizens while criminals are running around with guns. They are the ones we should be going after.

To me, debt is debt. The former prime minister promised to stay within a budget of \$40 billion, but the new Prime Minister is worse. He has ballooned the debt to \$80 billion.

Giovanna Mingarelli (Prescott—Russell—Cumberland, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Surrey Newton.

[*Translation*]

I am proud to rise today on behalf of the people of Prescott—Russell—Cumberland to share my thoughts on the new budget tabled this week.

Prescott—Russell—Cumberland is a predominantly francophone rural riding that is woven tightly into the economic and social fabric of Canada's national capital region. The region is home to families of farmers, entrepreneurs, teachers and community workers. It is a region where people believe in the values of hard work, solidarity and kindness.

Budget 2025 provides a generational investment to make Canada and Prescott—Russell—Cumberland stronger, more sustainable and more resilient. This budget sets out \$1 billion in investments over the next five years. I have been working hard to bring that investment to my riding and my community.

During my election campaign, I made sure the people of Prescott—Russell—Cumberland knew my priorities, including fighting against tariffs, supporting agriculture, SMES, industry and the francophonie, and treating people with dignity and inclusion.

[*English*]

Starting with tariffs, the effective U.S. tariff rate is now the highest it has been since the Great Depression in the 1930s. These tariffs are being applied to all countries and nearly all goods. I am proud to share that Canada has the best deal of any U.S. trading partner, with 85% of our trade being tariff-free. While some sectors remain deeply impacted, overall, Canadian exporters benefit from the lowest average U.S. tariff of any country, at 5.4%.

I am proud of the build communities strong fund, which will invest \$51 billion over 10 years, followed by \$3 billion per year on-going, to revitalize local infrastructure, including hospitals, universities and colleges, and build the new roads and bridges we need to move our goods. We will also use these funds to build water and transit systems that sustain our towns, municipalities and communities.

Given the urgency of the moment, the government has also announced a series of new measures to protect workers and businesses in sectors most impacted by U.S. tariffs and trade disruptions. During this time of uncertainty, our government is supporting Canadian auto workers, agricultural producers, manufacturers and other workers who have felt the effects of trade tensions.

Over \$25 billion has been announced in supports for workers and businesses. The government also expects \$4.4 billion in tariff revenue. These measures will help give industries and workers the tools they need to build a more resilient Canadian economy.

The Budget

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

On agriculture, over the past few months, I have had the opportunity to meet passionate farmers like Michel Dignard and Jeannette Mongeon, who have a farm together in Embrun, and families from the Gillette farm, which is also located in Embrun. These families have worked their land for generations. On my visits to these farms, they talked to me about sustainability, market access and the need to support the next generation of farmers. This budget recognizes these realities.

[*English*]

This budget invests over \$639 million over five years to strengthen agriculture, including with increased compensation for producers through AgriStability, enhanced marketing supports and temporary increases to the advance payments program.

These measures will help our farmers cope with rising costs, adapt to global market shifts and continue to feed our communities and our world. These investments mean that farms like the Dignard-Mongeon family farm and the Gillette farm will be able to keep innovating, diversifying their products and passing on their knowledge to the next generation.

Supporting our local industries and small and medium-sized businesses, which are the backbone of our rural economy, is also at the heart of our plan. We can think of businesses like Dunrobin Distilleries in Vankleek Hill, Nonna's Gelato in Plantagenet or the Homestead Pub in Embrun, all of which I had the pleasure to visit this summer. They keep our small towns alive, fun and thriving.

That is why I welcome the new federal initiatives like the Strategic Response Fund, a \$5-billion investment to help Canadian companies adapt, diversify, and grow. This includes \$1 billion in the strategic innovation fund to support the steel industry's transition toward new lines of business and strengthening domestic supply chains.

In Prescott—Russell—Cumberland, I have been fighting for our steelworkers at Ivaco Rolling Mills in L'Orignal, which helps protect hundreds of local jobs. I have met with them regularly since the spring. I have also had the pleasure of meeting with IMI Manufacturing, also in L'Orignal, which produces metal structures, generator shelters and base tanks. It is a company that strives to be a leader in safety and quality.

In Hawkesbury, Tulmar Safety Systems is helping Canada reach our 5% NATO goals. With over 30 years of innovation, Tulmar designs, manufactures and services advanced safety solutions for land, air and sea applications, serving the defence, aviation and civil safety industries worldwide. It is companies like Tulmar Safety Systems that will deliver against the budget's investments into the Canadian Armed Forces.

The budget proposes \$81.8 billion over five years, on a cash basis, starting in 2025, to rebuild, rearm and reinvest in the people who defend our country and keep us all safe. This includes over \$9 billion in 2025 that was announced by the Prime Minister in June.

Canada's new government is on a mission to build Canada strong through major infrastructure projects, a modern defence industry and millions more homes.

Through the new buy Canadian policy, we are making government a force for nation-building, becoming our own best customer, protecting Canadian businesses and empowering our workers with high-paying careers that build prosperity here at home. The new buy Canadian policy is so important because it moves us from our best efforts to a real obligation to buy Canadian, ensuring that our public dollars support local jobs and local businesses right here at home.

This budget is about building resilience, not dependence, and about giving our companies the tools they need to compete and succeed in a changing world.

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

The francophonie is another key pillar in my riding. This week, I had the privilege of attending the welcoming francophone community of Hawkesbury's community forum to mark National Francophone Immigration Week. I met inspiring newcomers and families who have chosen to live, work, and raise their children in French. They enrich our communities and strengthen the social fabric of Canada and, most importantly, of Prescott—Russell—Cumberland.

Today, I am also thinking of our francophone community organizations, such as the Prescott and Russell chapter of the Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, which works tirelessly to provide services, promote culture and support integration. That is why I am delighted that this budget supports our francophone institutions and invests in programs like Canadian Heritage's building communities through arts and heritage program, which provides support for festivals, cultural projects and the vitality of our regions.

Last week, I also met with passionate members of the Fédération des aînés francophones du Canada, which champions the rights and interests of seniors in minority situations to help them thrive in their own language and culture.

Of course, protecting CBC/Radio-Canada is part of that vision, with a \$150-million investment to modernize our public broadcaster and ensure that it provides high-quality programming in French and English. I also want to acknowledge the outstanding work of our local newspapers in Prescott—Russell—Cumberland, which are essential to democracy and to the vitality of our regions: Le Carillon, The Review, Vision, Tribune-Express, Reflet-News, Le Régional, TVC22 and others.

The Budget

[English]

I am very proud of this budget's \$38.4 million over three years, starting in 2026, to Canadian Heritage for the special measures for journalism component of the Canada periodical fund to help small and community news outlets continue producing quality Canadian editorial and journalistic content.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like me, my colleague represents one of the ridings with the highest proportion of francophones outside Quebec. As she mentioned, our budget includes a number of interesting measures, including ambitious immigration targets that could put the demographic weight of francophone communities back on a path to growth. It also includes support for arts and culture and increased funding for CBC/Radio-Canada. This is in addition to the historic investments the government made in official languages in 2023. These were the largest investments to support our official languages in the history of Canada.

I would like to ask my colleague the following question. Why is it important to her, as it is to me, to be part of a government that cares about our francophone communities and that is putting concrete measures in place to support their vitality and population growth?

Giovanna Mingarelli (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, Prescott—Russell—Cumberland is the only riding in the province of Ontario that is predominantly francophone. It is very important for our community and our local organizations to receive funding and support for official languages from the federal government. In fact, 60% of our population is francophone, and 40% is anglophone. It is very important to continue to support funding and projects that will promote official languages in our region.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing the Liberals say that this is a visionary budget for future generations. However, the budget provides no new money for the environment, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is also no money for protecting parks. This morning, the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development said that Canada was not on track to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets or its protected area targets for either 2025 or 2030.

How can this budget address the climate crisis and biodiversity loss if there is not a penny for climate, parks and biodiversity?

Giovanna Mingarelli: Mr. Speaker, our government is doing a lot to support the fight against climate change. I am very proud of everything we are doing in that regard.

• (1615)

[English]

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for young people trying to build their life and start a family, the Liberals have erased the hope of ever owning their own home. What is their solution? It is more government, more bureaucracy and more of the same problems. The Prime Minister told young people they must suffer.

My question for the member is this: Why did the Liberal government not listen to the Conservatives? We suggested eliminating the

GST on all home sales up to \$1.3 million and cutting development charges to get homes built.

Giovanna Mingarelli: Mr. Speaker, the government is doing a lot to support affordable housing, including the Build Canada Homes fund, which is providing billions of dollars in funding to build sustainable homes, especially for the most vulnerable in society. I would invite the hon. member to consult the Build Canada Homes fund to explore all the great ways that Canadians, especially youth, are being supported by the initiative.

[Translation]

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that this budget includes funding to support francophone communities across the country, including Acadians. Funding for National Acadian Day festivities has been doubled and made permanent.

Could my hon. colleague talk to us about the importance of supporting the francophonie, not only in her riding, but across Canada?

Giovanna Mingarelli: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for this excellent question.

I am very proud that new funds are being allocated to support National Acadian Day. I think it is very important for all communities across Canada to have access to funds to promote our francophone communities in every corner of this beautiful country. When we promote francophone festivals and culture, the effect is twofold, because we are also promoting official languages, which enrich our country.

[English]

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Richmond Centre—Marpole.

I rise today as the member elected by the citizens of Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, and I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to thank those constituents for the trust they have vested in me. Representing constituents is central to the work of all members. Through all the many demands and distractions we face as elected members, we must never forget that Canadians have vested their trust in us and chosen us to come to this place to be their advocates.

I was first elected to the House on October 19, 2015, some 10 years and 18 days ago. Who is counting, though? Suffice it to say that since then, much has changed for all of us and for Canada, but as it has been said, the more things change, the more they remain the same.

The Budget

My first budget speech was on April 14, 2016 and I would like to share with the House some of the points from that budget speech, because they are indeed as relevant today to this debate as they were then. On that day nearly 500 weeks ago, I stood in the House and pressed the Liberal government on its broken promise of balancing the federal budget. Imagine that. In 2015, the Liberals campaigned on a promise to “return Canada to a balanced budget in [2019]”. It is a true story. It is on the public record. It was their 2015 election platform. It was a Liberal promise.

On April 14, 2016, I stood in the House and stated that budget 2016 was “completely silent on this promise and [was] vacant of any vision of returning our nation to a balanced budget. Surely, if the Liberals had a plan to deliver on their promise of a balanced budget in 2019, they would have put at least one line in their 269-page budget [2016]”.

However, they did not, and unfortunately for every Canadian paying taxes today and for decades to come, the Liberals' promise to balance the budget by 2019 was one of the first of many promises made to Canadians that was broken by the Liberals.

In my budget 2016 speech, I stated:

Sadly, the government appears to be dodging another promise it made to Canadians and has no plan on how to pay back this out-of-control borrowing and spending. The people of Canada want results from their government. The hard-working women and men of this nation, who go off to their jobs day in and day out, and their children are the ones who are now on the hook to repay this Liberal deficit.

Here we are, nine and a half years later, and my speech of 2016 is eerily relevant to today's debate of budget 2025. The more things change, the more things remain the same.

Some of the hard-working men and women who went off to work at their jobs day in and day out, whom I spoke of in 2016, have transitioned to retirement, but others have not because they cannot afford to because of Liberal inflation. The children of those hard-working women and men who went off to their jobs day in and day out, whom I spoke of in 2016, have also been directly affected by Liberal failures.

Some of the children I spoke of in 2016 have lost their lives to the opioid crisis that has ravaged this nation, from big cities to small rural communities, because the Liberal government failed to cut off the illegal flow of narcotics and narcotic precursors into Canada. However, these government failures that allowed lives in Canada to be extinguished by illicit narcotics did not occur during times of scarce government funding.

No, the Liberal government failed to protect Canadians with better border inspection services and law enforcement, during a decade in which the Liberals spent more deficit dollars than all previous deficit dollars spent since Confederation. That is right: There has been more deficit in the last 10 years than there was in the previous 150 years.

• (1620)

Today, the same children of those hard-working women and men whom I spoke of in 2016 are facing housing scarcity and, again, it is not for lack of concurrent massive government spending. Budget 2025 is the 10th consecutive deficit budget from the Liberals, and every Liberal deficit budget over the past decade has contained al-

locations aimed at increasing housing for Canadians. However, the self-evident reality is that Liberal deficit budgets have collectively failed to unleash homebuilding in Canada.

As I stated in 2016, the hard-working women and men of this nation, who walk to their jobs day in and day out, and their children are now on the hook to repay this Liberal deficit. The reality is that, when the federal government spends, Canadians pay. Sadly, regardless of whether government allocations and investments pay off, ordinary and extraordinary Canadians still pay. Therefore, once again, the hard-working women and men of this nation and their children are the ones who are on the hook to repay another Liberal deficit.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, we, as members of Parliament, must never forget that Canadians have vested their trust in us and chosen us to come to this place to be their advocates. When Canadians vest their trust in us, they expect a return on investment, and they deserve a return on investment. Canadians deserve value for their trust and value for the tax dollars that they have no choice but to pay, and it becomes increasingly difficult for Canadians to make the money they need to live and to pay the taxes to pay down the Liberal national debt.

In 2016, Trudeau's darling finance minister told Canadians to get used to so-called job churn, which is short-term employment and several career changes in a person's life. Well, even a blind squirrel finds an acorn from time to time, and in this instance the Liberal government was being honest with Canadians. Secure, stable, well-paying jobs are quickly disappearing across Canada, leaving Canadians to search for new careers, stalled in building nest eggs for retirement, delayed in buying a home and to only dream of one day being able to retire. This is the opposite of delivering citizens value for their investment of trust.

In my budget 2016 speech, I stated the following:

There is no plan for the government for balancing the budget, no plan for job creation, just a murky commitment and increasing public debt. The sad reality is that the budget falls short of the need for leadership that this nation requires.

Whether they are managing the finances of their households or businesses, Canadians understand and desire the values and notion of living within their means, handling their debt with prudence, and being disciplined and decisive in their spending. Unfortunately, the government is out of touch with Canadians in those regards.

My words from 2016 ring true today because the Liberal government has failed to connect unprecedented amounts of government spending with the plans and actions required to protect Canadians and communities from the threats and challenges that have only worsened and grown in number over the past decade. There is no shortage of pain and suffering across our nation today, so let us roll up our sleeves to get down to business to deliver results for the people who have vested their trust in us and in our ability to do so. We must be honest about what we are doing in this place, how it affects others and how it will affect them for decades. They are our fellow Canadians and communities who have vested their trust in each one of us.

The Budget

Last, I would also be remiss if I did not mention that I now represent a riding with nearly 550 kilometres of Trans-Canada Highway. People travel this route daily for their jobs, and millions of dollars worth of goods pass through the mountain passes every day. Some parts of this highway have not seen major improvement since the Rogers Pass was completed in 1962, over 63 years ago today. The word “highway” is only mentioned three times in this budget: twice in historical context and once in reference to the north.

Canadians who have vested their trust in us and chosen us to come to this place to be their advocates deserve better. We cannot let them down.

● (1625)

Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives seem to have a great deal of trouble finding anything good in this budget. I would point out that, in the budget, there is \$5 billion over seven years, starting in 2025-26, to Transport Canada to create the trade diversification corridor fund. I, too, have a large bit of the Trans-Canada Highway running through my riding.

Does the member not see a possibility that some of this money will go toward the Trans-Canada Highway and help his riding?

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope a portion of the spending will end up on that very incredible section of the Trans-Canada Highway that runs through Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies. The way the Liberals operate, it may go to rich Liberal friends.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have invented this notion of considering a budget balanced on the basis of operational spending. Under the Minister of Finance's newly invented rules, the Trudeau government would have had a budget surplus in 2015-16, followed by two years of balanced budgets, a surplus in 2018-19, and a budget surplus the year after the pandemic.

If someone in the private sector were to calculate capital according to those rules, it would be considered accounting fraud. Not one chartered professional accountant in Canada, not one auditor, would sign off on these financial statements.

What does my colleague think about the fact that the Prime Minister and the minister tried to use this dishonest tactic to hide 58% of their deficit from the public even as they assert that money spent on a FIFA soccer game or on a program to identify potential investments counts as investment?

What does my colleague think about these fraudulent tactics?

● (1630)

[English]

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, I would not dare say there is fraud or anything going on with the Liberal government. We are not allowed to say those kinds of things in the House.

The accounting practices of separating the capital spending from the operational spending is slight of hand. Someone may not pay attention to what is happening back here because I have them so busy

with what is happening up here. It is trickery. I do not trust the government, any more than any other Canadian should, to balance the books or manage the taxes that come out of every Canadians' pocket to fund this massive deficit.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we now know that the government is going to be abandoning the most important fiscal anchor, the debt-to-GDP ratio, which our allies use. Every serious country around the world uses it to guide itself.

Can the member speak to the seriousness of the fiscal anchor being abandoned and comment on why perhaps the government has chosen to do so?

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that very interesting question about debt-to-GDP ratios.

Anyone operating a business has to pay attention to their debt-to-net revenue ratio, otherwise they do not get to borrow from the banks, they do not get to borrow from anybody. I cannot believe the government is trying to pull the wool over Canadians' eyes by telling them not to worry about what it is doing because it says it is going to fix the books to make it look like Canada is doing well, and it is doing the opposite.

[Translation]

Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, judging by what the opposition parties are saying, one would think there is absolutely nothing good in this budget, everything is wrong and nothing works.

Canada is facing a rapidly changing world that is more uncertain than ever, as we know. The rules-based international order and the trading system that powered Canada's prosperity for decades are being reshaped.

Our AAA credit rating is the top credit rating in the world. The debt-to-GDP ratio is the lowest in the G7, and the long-term interest rate is the lowest in the G7, despite the current situation.

Does my colleague agree that we need to work together?

[English]

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member across the way talks about working together. That is what Conservatives have been trying to do. They have been trying to provide the Liberal government with ideas on how we can all work together as Canadians to bring down the debt so that we are not paying more in debt service costs than we are going to be paying in health care transfers and more in debt service costs than the GST is bringing in. That just does not make long-term fiscal sense.

We have a Prime Minister who fled England after destroying its economy. I do not want to see the same thing happen to Canada.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Northumberland—Clarke.

The Budget

This year's federal budget is a masterpiece of illusion, a glossy presentation that looks generous on paper but hides a mountain of debt, higher taxes and fewer opportunities. Canadians plainly say the Liberal government is drawing bigger cakes, digging deeper holes and leaving endless debts. Every year, the government paints another picture of prosperity, another big cake of promises. They promise growth, affordability and opportunity, but those promises are baked with borrowed money, frosted with rhetoric and served with no plan to pay the bills. The Liberals call it investing in Canadians. Canadians see it for what it is: a revolving door of borrowed money and recycled failures.

Behind every new announcement lies another layer of debt, money borrowed from the next generation to mask today's problems. The government is not managing the economy; it is borrowing from the future to buy the illusion of progress. Deficits that were once called temporary have become structural. This budget adds \$78 billion in new deficit spending, the costliest outside of COVID, and pushes total federal debt to \$1.35 trillion. Interest payments on that debt will reach \$55.6 billion next year, exceeding both the Canada health transfer and GST revenues.

Every dollar Canadians pay in GST now does not go to doctors and nurses but to bankers and bondholders. This is not fiscal stewardship; it is fiscal negligence disguised as compassion. When we add in provincial and municipal debts, Canadians now carry nearly \$100,000 per person in combined public liabilities. This is the real legacy of 10 years of Liberal ideology: a revolving door of borrowing, spending and taxing that spins faster every year while Canadians fall further behind. This budget once again proves that the Liberals never met a tax they did not like.

Let me be blunt. This is Canadians' experience. When we earn money, we are taxed. When we spend money, we are taxed. When we save money, we are still taxed. Canadians now pay more and get less. Families are stretched to the breaking point. Young Canadians cannot afford homes. Seniors are cutting back on food and medication. Small businesses are drowning in payroll taxes and red tape. The Liberals claim they are helping the middle class, but what they are really doing is taxing the middle class to death. The only growth they have created is in government bureaucracy, debt and despair.

The Prime Minister made five clear commitments six months ago, and he has broken every single one. He promised to cap the deficit at \$62 billion, but it is \$78 billion. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but both debt and inflation are rising. He promised to spend less, but spending has ballooned by \$90 billion, \$5,400 per household. He promised to cut municipal home-building taxes, but housing costs are higher than ever. He promised to attract investment, but the Royal Bank of Canada confirms investment is collapsing. The government says it is building prosperity, but it is burning through it instead.

RBC's "High stakes, narrow margins" report warns that this budget bets everything on "investment-led growth", a risky gamble that requires \$500 billion in new private investment. RBC also notes that the fiscal anchors are thin and that only one-third of new spending is actually productive capital. The rest is political scaffolding: programs designed to look like investment but that function like subsidies.

• (1635)

We have seen this before. The government incubates companies with taxpayer grants, photo ops and headlines. Those firms thrive temporarily and then move to more competitive jurisdictions once the subsidies expire.

This is not industrial strategy; this is industrial babysitting. It is fuelled by the industrial carbon tax, which is a policy that drives up costs for farmers, manufacturers, miners and energy workers while pushing investment abroad. This tax alone adds billions in compliance costs each year, eroding competitiveness and feeding the inflation it claims to fight. The result is a self-perpetuating cycle, a revolving-door economy in which government taxes production, subsidizes dependency and calls it growth. Conservatives will scrap this destructive tax and replace ideology with innovation: practical environmental policy that rewards results, not rhetoric.

The same pattern repeats in public safety. The government announces more funding, yet crime keeps climbing because laws remain weak and accountability absent. It spends millions to process crime but refuses to stop it. Offenders walk free; victims lose faith, and enforcement is ordered to suppress the issue without resolving it. This is the revolving door of justice. It is a system that cycles offenders through courtrooms without consequences while communities are forced to bear the damages and pay the price out of their own pockets.

Conservatives will stop this. We will restore mandatory minimums for the worst crimes, use the notwithstanding clause where and when it is absolutely necessary and return the focus of justice to the protection of victims, not the accommodation of offenders.

This budget is more than a financial document; it is a mirror reflecting a government trapped by its own ideology. When confronted with failure, it does not change course. It doubles down. When spending fails, it spends more. When regulations stall growth, it creates more. When inflation rises, it prints more. This is motion without direction and activity without achievement.

Leadership is not measured by how loudly new programs are announced but by whether those programs actually work. After 10 years of announcements, Canadians are asking a simple question: Where are the results?

The Budget

Conservatives offer a better way: common-sense leadership for all Canadians. We believe prosperity is built, not borrowed; government must live within its means as families do; and work should be rewarded, not taxed into discouragement. Our plan is clear: We will balance the budget to secure long-term stability, end hidden taxes and scrap the industrial carbon tax, cut wasteful spending and stop corporate welfare, streamline regulations to build homes and attract investment, and restore justice so that those who harm others face real consequences. We will replace the revolving door of ideology with a doorway to growth, accountability and hope.

Canada was built by people who worked, saved and built, not by governments that borrowed, taxed and apologized. We were a nation of builders. After 10 years of the Liberal government, we are now a nation that has borrowed \$100,000 for every man, woman and child in the country. It must stop.

Canadians need more. They need a government that measures success not by how much it spends but by how much it delivers.

• (1640)

They want a plan to stop the revolving door of debt, inflation and ideology, one that replaces it with affordability, accountability and growth.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): 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 Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Employment; the hon. member for York—Durham, Housing; the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleague was a municipal councillor before becoming a federal MP, so he understands the importance of infrastructure funding. The budget renews the Canada community-building fund with \$27.8 billion over 10 years. There are investments of over \$22 billion, including \$6 billion for regionally significant projects and \$17 billion for a provincial and territorial stream for housing-enabling infrastructure such as water, sewers and roads.

I believe that my colleague also has experience in the health care sector. We are also making a \$5-billion investment in health care infrastructure.

As a former municipal councillor and as someone who has professional experience in the health care sector, is my colleague as enthusiastic as I am about these infrastructure announcements?

• (1645)

[*English*]

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, he is right that I have experience in municipal government. This is the biggest difference: In the municipal government, we are not allowed to run a deficit budget. The Liberal government is recklessly running deficit budgets year after year. As I mentioned, the success of a government is not measured by how much it spends. It cannot just throw out money without any concrete results, especially as the Auditor General mentioned that it is

a systemic problem. The government spends money without monitoring and without measuring success.

I hope that it can learn from the municipal governments in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that my colleague has previously served as a city councillor. I would like to know his thoughts on the fact that the federal budget, as presented, includes only \$9 billion in new infrastructure funding over five years. Furthermore, within that, there is \$5 billion over three years for hospitals from coast to coast. Today, building a single teaching hospital costs more than \$5 billion. The Maisonneuve-Rosemont hospital in Montreal will cost even more.

As a city councillor, would my colleague have felt insulted to receive such crumbs from the federal government?

[*English*]

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems with the budget is that it has not addressed the problems that every Canadian is facing right now. The Liberals can promise a lot of things for the future, but they have done nothing about the real problems that Canadians are facing day in and day out. They can promise a hospital, but where are the doctors? Where is the medical staff? They could not even get this problem fixed. They are just giving us another rosy picture so that we can forget what we are suffering right now. This is deceptive.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course, if we go back a few months, we heard, time and time again, one of those slogans that the government used and that the Prime Minister used, which was around spending less. We now have the budget, and we see that they are spending \$141 billion more. The deficit is bigger than he promised. We have a mounting amount of debt, at \$324 billion more. There are Canadians who voted and who put their faith in the slogan of spending less. That is not what is reflected in the budget.

Could the hon. member speak to how his constituents may feel after seeing the budget?

The Budget

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, this is the reality that Canadians are facing right now. When the government is building a bigger and bigger deficit, one day, the debt has to be repaid. That is why taxes are going to be bigger and bigger in the future. As I mentioned, Canadians are already facing the fact that when we earn money, we pay taxes. When we spend money, we have to pay taxes. Even when we save money, we also have to pay taxes. This is the reality the deficit creates. Tax, tax, tax is the daily experience of Canadians.

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and privilege to rise in this House. At the end of the day, I do not think there is a better saying to sum up this budget than Winston Churchill's; he said that a nation trying to tax itself into prosperity is akin to a man jumping into a bucket and then yanking on the handle and wondering why he did not get pulled up. There has never once been a country in the entire history of humanity that has been able to tax itself into prosperity, and it will not start here.

I wanted to start with a bit of fun, but it makes a point. Of course, the deficit was announced at \$78 billion. That can be hard for people to wrap their heads around. Seventy-eight billion is not a number that most people will come across. Maybe if they work for Brookfield they will, but the rest of us really will not have that opportunity, so I will give people an idea of what they could do with \$78 billion.

With \$78 billion, they could buy over 7,000 private islands. They could buy over 700 Icon-class mega-yachts. Those are the types that Jeff Bezos and Brookfield-type folks have. They could buy over 30,000 luxury homes in Beverly Hills. They could buy 100 of the top soccer clubs. They could buy about 15 or so NFL franchises. They could buy themselves 15,000 private jets.

If people are not interested in those wealthy accoutrements, I have more ideas people might be interested in. They could fund the World Food Programme to end hunger at the United Nations for 10 years. For 10 years, they could feed the hungry. Maybe space exploration is of interest to people. For \$78 billion, they could fly 780 Artemis moon missions. Maybe someone is into clean energy and thinks that is important, as I do. They could install 1,500 gigawatt facilities. Health care, of course, is important to us all. If we did not have this deficit, we could build over 7,000 hospitals. In education, we could endow over 1,500 Harvards across this country with \$78 billion.

This one is fun: If we took \$100 bills and stacked them to reach \$78 billion, we would be higher than the orbit for space. If we had gold, we would have 10% of all the gold ever mined in human history. That is 39 billion iPhones. It is also enough to give everyone on the planet \$10. That is a lot of money.

I will tell members what some of the experts have said as well.

Kim Moody said:

The ugly outweighs the good by a significant amount. This budget is a financial disaster. Our youth and future new Canadians will be left to pay off the massive spending spree well past when the authors of this mess are gone. And to pay it off there are really only three paths: significant tax increases to pay down the growing debt and increased debt charges; significant austerity or both.

In the end, this budget isn't a spaghetti western, it's a slow-motion fiscal shootout where taxpayers are the ones left holding the smoking gun. The good parts

are minor cameos, the bad dominates the middle, and the ugly rides off with our future saddled in debt.

If this is what passes for "generational investment," future generations may wish they'd been written out of the script.

That is the reality of the budget. I have had a bit of fun to show what \$78 billion could get us, and we have heard from some of the experts. The reality is that this is a scary time for Canada. This budget will encumber our country with generational debt, without any positive transformation, or none to point to. There are 78 billion reasons we should not vote for the budget.

The reality is that we are coming off 10 years of what we can call fiscal malfeasance. The government has failed Canadians at every turn. In the last 10 years, we have had the worst economic growth since the Great Depression. How did we get here? The government created a fiscal imbalance. Increasingly, it put more and more resources into the public sector while starving the private sector.

• (1650)

The public sector is absolutely necessary and is important for our safety net, health care and equity, but at some point, we have to stop starving the private sector of resources. It is ultimately where our productivity comes from.

It is not shocking, then, that as the government increasingly reallocated resources from the private sector to the public sector, we saw declining productivity. The OECD has us ranked as one of the worst performers with respect to productivity. That is not because we do not have the best workers in the world. We do. Where the problem lies is in both innovation and capital.

We have been one of the worst countries over the last 10 years with respect to investments. An American worker, for example, has two to three times as much investment in the tools and equipment they are utilizing compared to a Canadian worker. There is an analogy I often use. If two workers are competing to dig a hole and one has a shovel and the other has a backhoe, the one who has the backhoe will win 100 times no matter how hard the man or woman with the shovel works at digging the hole.

We have seen the economy increasingly starved of capital. What is the government's response? It is going to suffocate the private sector more. It is going to suck more resources out of the private sector and out of the women and men who have the best ability to reallocate resources.

The Budget

Ultimately, what happens when there is an allocation of resources? The way that capitalism works is it counts on millions of Canadians to make thousands of different decisions. Those individual decision points allow us to be more efficient. What has happened in Ottawa is an increasing centralization of those funds. We have taken the money from all the people who have earned it and are so brilliant at allocating resources and given it to bureaucrats to, unfortunately in many cases, squander, as we have seen with the green slush fund and the numerous scandals of money going out the door. We need to get more of those resources back to the individuals who actually earned them and are so careful with spending each and every dollar, to maximize resources as we go forward.

The Liberals will say they are spending less and spending more at the same time. This is a George Orwell-type quote for them to say. They tell the Conservatives they are spending less and tell the NDP they are spending more. Obviously, they cannot do both things at the same time, even though that is what they say.

The verdict is in. We see that program spending is going to increase by over 16% to over \$100 billion. What is that going to result in? It will result in debt charges growing from over \$50 billion to over \$70 billion. That money has to come from somewhere. It will come from hard-working Canadians through either direct taxation or inflation. Either way, we are withdrawing more money from the private sector. That in itself is not good.

The challenge is that it hurts even more than that, because money in the private sector gets multiplied. It becomes more money, as great entrepreneurs across this land, from Quebec to British Columbia, utilize that cash to grow their businesses and employ more people, who then go out and spend more money to empower more businesses. This is as opposed to the government's plan to take truckloads of more and more money to Ottawa and dump it on the fire. That money does not get multiplied. In fact, it gets reduced.

After nearly 100 years of undeniable truth, we have found that when we reduce the burden on the private sector, when we reduce the burden on the people and when we give them more freedom, there is more prosperity. That has been the case for well over 100 years. Whenever tax cuts have happened, whether by Brian Mulroney, Stephen Harper or any of the great prime ministers of the past, we grew the economy. Every time we have increased taxes, the economy has contracted.

We can see this. As one of the most compelling pieces of evidence, if we track the Canadian dollar over the last 30 or 40 years, we see that underneath every single Conservative prime minister, the Canadian dollar has spiked in value. Do members know what happens as soon as a Liberal is elected? It falls almost directly. It is really uncanny. It dips down.

We had an opportunity to free our people or pad Liberal insiders and bureaucrats, and we know what the Liberals have decided to do.

• (1655)

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just prior to the member's speech, we heard a speech from a Rich-

mond city councillor who is also currently sitting as the member of Parliament for Richmond Centre—Marpole.

I got a little chuckle out of his speech because he talked about wasteful spending. Let us look at the Lulu Island waste-water treatment plant, the Iona waste-water treatment plant and a number of infrastructure investments that were done in Richmond, British Columbia, my hometown, like the pump stations, the dykes, and the soccer field at the Olympic Oval, which is in the member for Richmond Centre—Marpole's riding. He took photos with me at every announcement.

I am curious. Does the member opposite think that is wasteful investment for our city, as he said, or should we not continue to have this money go back to the communities that are important—

• (1700)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Northumberland—Clarke.

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, with \$78 billion, we could rebuild his entire community, every house, every hospital. We could rebuild everything. For \$50 billion in interest, we could rebuild the member opposite's entire community as well.

Instead of spending money on debt and deficits and helping the people at Brookfield, let us actually help Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that my colleague's speech further highlights the issue of fiscal imbalance. He said that the money is in Ottawa, but the obligations and commitments are in Quebec City.

Earlier, I asked one of my colleagues a question about health transfers, which are not in there. They are putting \$5 billion into hospitals, but, as health care workers told me this week, that is a hospital-centric vision and is not going to provide the health care system with the means and human resources it needs. Another area that contributes to this fiscal imbalance is infrastructure. I am not the only one saying this. Even people in Quebec City are saying it. We are also hearing it more and more from municipalities, especially with climate change impacting municipal finances and infrastructure. We are far from where we need to be. This is nowhere near what cities and Quebec have asked for in terms of infrastructure.

What does my colleague think about the fact that this budget increases the fiscal imbalance?

[*English*]

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that, as the government continues to grow its debt and deficits and mortgage Canada's future, Quebec and the rest of the provinces will see decreasing amounts of investment in them. The money will just run out.

The Budget

If we squeeze and squeeze the private sector, eventually it will stop producing golden eggs. We need to reinvest in the private sector. We need to reinvest in Canadians, not the Canadian government.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what really caught my attention about this budget and the member's speech is the missed opportunity to repeal bills like Bill C-48 and Bill C-69. These bills are barriers to the success of our economy.

What the Liberals like to do, and this is what they always do, is make it so the entire Canadian economy is dependent on a decision that one or two people over there make. There used to be pipeline projects. Over 18 LNG export terminals were inherited by Justin Trudeau in 2015. All of those are gone.

The Liberals put all these barriers in place, and then they spend billions and billions of taxpayer dollars to partner with somebody they might find in the private sector in order to do something. They chased away Kinder Morgan, for example, which was going to build a pipeline for less than \$10 billion, and it blossomed to over \$30 billion.

Does my colleague agree with me that the government basically just wants to control every single aspect of the Canadian economy? What is that doing to ruin the hope and future—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Northumberland—Clarke.

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, when the government picks winners and losers, the ultimate losers are Canadians. It is individual Canadian businesswomen and businessmen who are in the best position to make those decisions.

With respect to Bill C-69 and other pieces of legislation like it, the reality is that in Canada we have a GDP-per-hour problem, a productivity issue. The average in Canada is about \$50 to \$60. In oil and gas, it is \$500. If we want to solve our productivity problem, it goes through Alberta, Canadian energy and Canadian oil and gas.

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak in support of budget 2025, a budget that lays out a bold, forward-looking plan to build a stronger, more resilient Canada. At its core, budget 2025 recognizes that Canada stands at a turning point. Around the world, we see shifting trade relationships, rising global uncertainty, an increasingly competitive international economy and increasing international turmoil. These challenges require a plan that strengthens our foundations and builds for the long term. That is exactly what this budget delivers.

It is a plan that builds Canada strong by spending less on government operations and more on the people, industries and infrastructure that will define our future. It is a plan that balances fiscal discipline with ambition. While maintaining the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, our government is making historic, nation-building investments in housing, infrastructure and innovation.

Budget 2025 is a plan to catalyze \$1 trillion in investments over the next five years. Central to that plan is building major infrastructure, more homes and stronger communities. This \$1 trillion in investments is going to change Canada and who we are.

Over the next five years, budget 2025 commits nearly \$280 billion in new investments to improve Canada's economy and empower Canadians to succeed. This includes \$115 billion for infrastructure to modernize our cities, expand our trade corridors and ensure that every community across Canada has the tools it needs to grow. It includes \$110 billion to boost productivity and innovation through investments in emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and clean energy. It includes \$30 billion for defence and security, ensuring that Canada can protect its sovereignty and play a leadership role in the world. It also includes \$25 billion for housing through the new Build Canada Homes initiative, which is a program that will double the pace of construction, lower costs for first-time homebuyers and create good-paying jobs.

Not only that, but as I have a history in this House, I can tell members that for the last decades, we have not seen a single dollar invested in health care capital investments. This budget includes \$5 billion for health-related infrastructure. Whether I travel to Edmonton or am in Surrey, British Columbia, I see that people are looking for hospital infrastructure. This fund is going to help not only the people in Surrey, but people from coast to coast to coast.

Together, these investments will not only strengthen our economy but also improve the quality of life for Canadians in every region.

This budget is also about efficiency and accountability. Through a comprehensive expenditure review, our government will save \$60 billion over five years by cutting red tape and modernizing operations. Is that not what the Conservatives are looking for? I think that is what they are looking for. That \$60 billion in savings is right there.

● (1705)

In doing so, we are shifting from a model of endless operating growth to one of strategic investment, focusing every dollar on projects that build productivity, competitiveness and resilience. By 2028-29, our goal is to balance day-to-day spending with revenues, while maintaining a modest deficit entirely tied to long-term investments that grow the economy.

The vision of budget 2025 is guided by four key objectives.

The Budget

First is focusing our strengths and recognizing that Canada has what the world needs: clean and conventional energy, critical minerals, advanced technology and a highly educated workforce. We are an energy and innovation superpower, and we are investing in our ability to lead in both.

The second objective is building our nation. We will be delivering on major projects that connect our regions, create high-paying jobs and support Canadian industries like steel and softwood lumber. The Build Canada Homes initiative is one example of how we are creating growth that Canadians can see and feel in their daily lives.

The third objective is unifying our economy. Through the One Canadian Economy Act, we will break down interprovincial trade barriers, open new opportunities for workers and businesses, and ensure indigenous communities are full partners in Canada's growth.

The fourth objective is diversifying our trade. We are expanding beyond traditional markets and developing a more flexible, resilient network of partners. With initiatives such as the trade diversification strategy and other major projects, Canada would strengthen its trade corridors, open new markets and build a more resilient export economy.

While these are national goals, they are felt most directly also at the local level. In communities like Surrey Newton, or Richmond Centre—Marpole, these matter. Surrey is one of the fastest-growing cities in Canada. It is a place of opportunity, diversity and entrepreneurship, but as we grow, we need infrastructure that keeps pace. We need parks, transit and community spaces that improve quality of life. Contrary to what the member for Richmond Centre—Marpole was saying earlier, that cities do not need investments in their parks and in their sports, that is not acceptable.

When we go to the mayors of cities, I hear appreciation for what we have done in this budget. That is why I am particularly proud that budget 2025 includes federal support for upgrades to Newton Athletic Park. This investment would deliver new artificial-turf fields, practice areas, tennis courts and walking paths, which would provide families and young people in Surrey Newton with safer, more accessible and modern recreational spaces.

This is not the end. In fact, in the whole of British Columbia, the Filipino community has been advocating for a long time for their community centre. When they met with me, I went to the hon. member for Winnipeg North for his advice because he is very involved in the Filipino community. In fact, he was a strong advocate that we need to get something like that done, and that was delivered, the Filipino cultural and community centre in Metro Vancouver, British Columbia. That is what our government is doing and will deliver.

The list goes on. In fact, White Rock, which is the riding next door to me, will get a pier as well. These are the kinds of community investments that make a difference in people's daily lives: spaces where children can play, where families can gather and where newcomers can feel part of our community.

• (1710)

That is what the budget is all about: building a stronger Canada, not just through national policy but also through local action on the ground. Budget 2025 also strengthens community safety, an issue that residents in Surrey Newton care deeply about. We are investing in 1,000 new RCMP officers and 1,000 new CBSA officers, and 150 of them will be assigned to deal just with financial crimes.

These are the kinds of investments we need, so I would request that all members, the Conservatives, the Bloc, NDP and Green members, support this budget and—

• (1715)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): It being 5:15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the subamendment now before the House.

The question is on the subamendment.

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

Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

• (1745)

The Speaker: The question is as follows.

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of amendment to the amendment to House]

• (1800)

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 48)

YEAS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Block
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Chambers
Cobena	Cody
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson

The Budget

Deltell	DeRidder	Champoux	Chang
Diotte	Doherty	Chartrand	Chatel
Dowdall	Duncan	Chen	Chenette
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Chi	Church
Falk (Provencher)	Gallant	Clark	Connors
Généreux	Genus	Cormier	Coteau
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)	Dabrusin	Dandurand
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)	Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu	DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Godin	Gourde	Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Groleau	Guglielmin	Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Gunn	Hallan	Dhillon	Diab
Hardy	Ho	Duclos	Duguid
Hoback	Holman	Dzerowicz	Earle
Jackson	Jansen	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Jivani	Kelly	Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Khanna	Kibble	Fancy	Fanjoy
Kirkland	Kmiec	Fergus	Fisher
Konanz	Kram	Fonseca	Fortier
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Kuruc	Kusic	Fraser	Freeland
Lake	Lantsman	Fry	Fuhr
Lawrence	Lawton	Gaheer	Gainey
Lefebvre	Leslie	Garon	Gasparro
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lloyd	Lobb	Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Ma	Mahal		Grant
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Gould	Guay
	Martel	Greaves	Gull-Masty
Mantle	McCauley	Guilbeault	Hanley
Mazier	McLean (Calgary Centre)	Hajdu	Hepfner
McKenzie	Menegakis	Harrison	Hodgson
Melillo	Morin	Hirtle	Housefather
Moore	Motz	Hogan	Iacono
Morrison	Nater	Hussen	Jaczek
Muys	Paul-Hus	Idlout	Joly
Patzer	Redekopp	Johns	Kayabaga
Poilievre	Rempel Garner	Joseph	Khalid
Reid	Richards	Kelloway	Koutrakis
Reynolds	Rood	Klassen	Lambropoulos
Roberts	Rowe	Lalonde	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Ross	Scheer	Lamoureux	Larouche
Ruff	Seeback	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lauzon
Schmale	Small	Lattanzio	Lavoie
Shipley	Stevenson	Lavack	Leitão
Steinley	Strauss	LeBlanc	Lightbound
Strahl	Tochor	Lemire	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Thomas	Uppal	Long	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Tolmie	Vien	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Van Popta	Vis	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	May
Viersen	Warkentin	Maloney	McKelvie
Wagantall	Williamson	McGuinty	McKnight
Waugh		McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McPherson
Zimmer — 139		McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	Mendès
		Ménard	Miedema
		Michel	Mingarelli
		Miller	Myles
		Morrissey	Nathan
		Naqvi	Noormohamed
		Nguyen	Ntumba
		Normandin	Olszewski
		Oliphant	Osborne
		O'Rourke	Petitpas Taylor
		Perron	Powlowski
		Plamondon	Ramsay
		Provost	Robertson
		Rana	Romanado
		Rocheffort	Sahota
		Royer	Sari
		Saini	Savard-Tremblay
		Sari	Schiefke
		Sawatzky	Sheehan
		Sgro	

NAYS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinipi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne

Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 198

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1805)

[English]

CLEAN COASTS ACT

Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.) moved that Bill C-244, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as one of the 5.5 million Canadians who has the privilege of living on Canada's coast, I know it is not just where we live; it is part of who we are, from learning about the life cycle of salmon as a child to fishing in our rivers and oceans and experiencing the incredible feeling of seeing a whale in the wild. It is what brings residents and visitors together, drives our economy and puts food on the table.

Today, these same coastlines face mounting pressures from marine pollution and abandoned and derelict boats. Coastal residents see these impacts every single day. They have written letters, raised petitions and met with every level of government, saying the same thing: Our laws and policies are simply not getting the job done. They want us to do something about it. They know that our oceans are for the common benefit, but they are not a common dumping ground. They are frustrated because they see what happens when governments act too late when a vessel sinks, fuel leaks and community bears the cost of a problem that should have been prevented. That is why I am honoured to rise today to speak to my private members' bill, Bill C-244, the clean coasts act.

The legislation strengthens Canada's ability to prevent and respond to marine pollution by closing two critical gaps in our laws: First, it clarifies that marine dumping is a strict liability offence under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, and second, it amends the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act to prohibit the transfer of vessels to individuals the seller knows does not have the means to maintain or dispose of them safely. Together, these two measures will deter the reckless behaviour that endangers our coasts and ensure that those who pollute our oceans, not the public, are responsible for cleaning up their waste.

Private Members' Business

These amendments respond directly to challenges that coastal communities, particularly in British Columbia, face every day. Coastal residents see the cumulative impact of marine pollution, derelict vessels and infrastructure that is breaking down.

Nowhere is this happening more than in Porpoise Bay, where long-time residents, such as Angelia, have watched this decline unfold over their lifetimes. She grew up swimming and digging clams with her family, but today, she does not believe she will ever swim there again. The bay, where her neighbour's grandchildren now play, is scattered with derelict boats and floating debris that leach oil, fuel and waste into the water. What was once a clear, healthy inlet has become clouded with pollution and garbage from decaying vessels. The same children who may have spent their weekends searching for shells now spend their time picking up plastic and broken foam that washes ashore.

For Elaine, who runs a small waterfront bed and breakfast that was once featured in The New York Times as one of Canada's most scenic coastal getaways, this has become an economic issue as much as an environmental one. Guests no longer see a pristine bay; they see a flotilla of abandoned boats and improvised structures. Tourism suffers, and all the local businesses that depend on it do as well.

When governments are slow to act, people like Don McKenzie, a 90-year-old marina operator, take matters into their own hands. Don has spent years pumping water out of sinking vessels at his own expense because he knows that once they go down, the cost is 10 times greater to deal with them, which ultimately falls to taxpayers. I thank Don for all that he does.

Beyond derelict boats, other forms of marine pollution are also taking a toll. Along the coast, we see styrofoam from decaying docks and aquaculture facilities that are breaking apart into thousands of small fragments that spread across beaches and into fragile habitats.

Community groups, such as the West Vancouver Shoreline Preservation Society, Atl'ka7sem/Howe Sound Marine Stewardship Initiative and the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association, as well as their volunteers, dedicate countless hours to cleaning up what stronger laws could have prevented from entering the ocean in the first place. Cleanups across British Columbia's coasts can cost thousands of dollars per kilometre. These are costs borne not by polluters but by local residents and volunteers.

These are not isolated frustrations; they are symptoms of a system that reacts only after the damage is done. While communities such as Gibsons, Sechelt and Bowen Island see these impacts up close, the same legal gaps are evident on a larger scale. When pollution reaches the ocean, the effects ripple far beyond one bay or harbour.

Private Members' Business

The Canadian Environmental Protection Act, or CEPA, is the most important environmental law in Canada. It protects people and the environment from toxic substances, but given how the court has interpreted the marine dumping provisions of CEPA, only intentional discharges into the ocean are now prohibited. This means that even when careless acts, omissions or poor maintenance lead to dumping in our oceans, individuals or companies can escape responsibility.

● (1810)

The 2015 *Marathassa* oil spill in Vancouver's English Bay makes this very clear. A newly built bulk carrier leaked more than 2,700 litres of bunker oil into the ocean, coating nearby beaches, marine life and shoreline habitats. The cleanup costs were in the millions of dollars. It took weeks and involved volunteers, municipalities, first nations and the Coast Guard. Even after all these efforts, we know that the oil spilled continues to have a long-term impact.

Despite dumping oil into the bay for days, the ship's owners were ultimately acquitted of all charges. This case revealed a critical flaw. It placed the burden on the public to prove intention rather than on the polluter to demonstrate responsibility.

The clean coasts act would correct that imbalance. It would establish a strict liability framework that would shift the onus of proof from the Crown to the polluter. Under this model, if a vessel releases pollution into the marine environment, the owner or operator must prove that they took all appropriate steps to prevent it. They must do what a reasonable person would do in the same situation and simply act responsibly. This is what was always intended by the act, and this bill clarifies that that would be the case going forward.

This is not about criminalizing accidents. It is about ensuring that those who operate in our waters meet the highest standards we expect of them. It would encourage better maintenance, safety protocols and planning, saving both money and our oceans. By placing accountability where it belongs, on those in control of the vessels that could cause harm, the clean coasts act would make prevention the rule rather than the exception.

The Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act, or WAHVA, passed in 2019, was an important step forward. WAHVA made it an offence to abandon a vessel, rather than what someone should be doing in these cases, which is properly dispose of it. Incredibly, this was not prohibited before then.

In creating this new prohibition to abandon a vessel, we created an incentive for people to avoid it. Some vessel owners now try to sidestep accountability by transferring boats, usually at the end of their useful life, to people who they know cannot maintain them. These transfers are easy to find. Residents have shared screenshots of online listings on platforms like Craigslist, where boats are offered for a dollar or free to a good home. In some cases, the same sites advertized "off-grid moorage" or "tie-ups on makeshift floats", inviting others to live on the water without proper facilities, order, permission or oversight.

Some might ask who would voluntarily take on this type of liability. Too often, it is some of the most vulnerable people in our society, such as the unhoused simply looking for a roof over their

head. They have more immediate things to worry about than the cost of properly disposing of a vessel.

Some might ask why this is a problem. These vessels are often not seaworthy and are at risk of sinking. In Porpoise Bay, that danger became real when a man who was living on an unseaworthy vessel tragically lost his life when trying to reach the shore in a small dinghy. Beyond the danger to human life, these vessels pose ongoing navigation hazards and increase the risk of waste being dumped into coastal waters, factors that degrade the water quality in the surrounding region.

In speaking with organizations like the Coastal Restoration Society, which has removed over 100 derelict vessels from B.C.'s coastline since 2017, I have heard first-hand how costly it is to remove these vessels once they have sunk. Safely removing a single 45-foot wooden vessel can cost upward of \$40,000, costs that small port authorities and boat owners simply cannot afford, and this is on the cheaper side. Without accessible disposal options, many vessels are stripped for parts and then left to deteriorate in the water, leaking pollutants into the nearby ecosystem.

The clean coasts act would close an important loophole. It would prohibit the transfer of a vessel to anyone the seller knows lacks the means to maintain it safely and would ensure that accountability follows a vessel throughout its life cycle so ownership cannot be off-loaded to avoid responsibility.

The clean coasts act would build on progress that Canada has already made in oceans protection. It would strengthen existing tools rather than creating new ones. Through the oceans protection plan, we have improved spill response and habitat restoration and have provided funding to remove sunken boats through the abandoned boats program.

● (1815)

This is about getting ahead of the problem and dealing with it in a much cheaper way, but those efforts can succeed only when the laws that underpin them are enforceable. The clean coasts act would provide that clarity, ensuring that both CEPA and WAHVA work effectively. This is not a radical reform but a practical fix that would deliver results on the water and better value for taxpayers.

Private Members' Business

Protecting our oceans is not just a national duty; it is a shared responsibility across every level of government. Right now, responsibility for derelict and abandoned vessels is scattered. Transport Canada oversees navigation safety, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans manages small craft harbours, Environment and Climate Change Canada responds to pollution, and the Coast Guard steps in during emergencies. Provincially, jurisdiction extends over the in-shore seabed and shorelines, and municipalities are left managing the impacts within their boundaries.

The result is too often a finger-pointing exercise, with no single body clearly accountable for prevention and enforcement. Communities like Sechelt have seen what happens when this patchwork approach fails: Pollution worsens, vessels sink and coastal communities and taxpayers bear the cost. The clean coasts act is about ending that cycle. It focuses on prevention, ensuring that responsibility could not be passed from one owner, one jurisdiction or one ministry to another.

There has already been strong leadership from local organizations and from volunteers who are stepping up to do the work that should not fall to them. Groups like the Dead Boats Disposal Society show that Canadians are ready to act. They need the federal government to back them up with the right tools.

I would also say that the issue is not partisan. The Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, in its bipartisan report on abandoned and derelict vessels, offered important recommendations to address the issue, including thoughtful suggestions in the Conservatives' supplementary report. I want to recognize the member for Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, the Conservative Party critic for fisheries, for his work in this space and particularly for the recommendation that I deeply agree with and that the government should adopt: to require boat sellers rather than boat buyers to register the transfers of boats.

I would also like to thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni for seconding the bill and for his long-standing advocacy on dealing with the issue of derelict vessels, which absolutely plagues his riding as well.

We would not have the WAHVA framework were it not for the private member's bill that former fisheries minister Bernadette Jordan brought forward. More locally, the former MP for my riding, John Weston, has also long been a champion of this issue.

We all care about clean coasts and know that the bill alone will not solve the problem. We need a modernized vessel registry system so we can effectively identify vessel ownership, and we need a sufficient and sustainable source of funding through the vessel remediation fund to remove and dispose of vessels for which we cannot identify the owners. These two regulations are long overdue, and I call on the government to act urgently to finalize them.

Furthermore, on the west coast, there is still no dedicated facility for dismantling or recycling end-of-life vessels. We need to change this. We need to make it both easy and affordable for boat owners to properly dispose of their boats. Pairing this with legislative reform, we can make a lasting difference of addressing the root causes of marine pollution rather than only its much more costly symptoms.

In conclusion, I want to add that a recent poll by Glacier Media shows that nearly 97% of respondents are in favour of stricter regulation of marine dumping and derelict vessels. The clean coasts act would respond to exactly that, so I invite all members to support this pragmatic step, to stand with coastal communities, to honour the people who have been calling for action for years, and to ensure that our oceans remain clean, healthy and productive for generations to come.

• (1820)

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for his concern for the environment and for derelict vessels on the coasts of British Columbia, and for pointing out, to quote the member opposite, that the government is “slow to act”.

Indeed it is a reflection of a failing economy that there has been an explosion of abandoned vessels that have gone from being just boats that are broken down to being ones that people are now turning into small towns to live in. Indeed there is a problem.

The member opposite indicated that the bill would put the onus on the seller, and that the seller would have liability for a boat and the actions of the new owner. Could the member opposite perhaps explain what liabilities the seller would then have, with the onus on them, as a new owner would take on that boat? Would it just be the environmental impact or other impacts as well?

The example I would like to give is that of selling a car. Once it is registered with the new owner, the new owner should take on the responsibilities—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

Patrick Weiler: Mr. Speaker, it is an important question. With the changes proposed in the bill, there would be an obligation for the seller to take steps to ensure that they are not selling to someone who they know does not have the means to maintain it or properly dispose of it. There are a lot of ways that one can do that, such as properly disclosing the current condition of the boat and ensuring that the seller can also provide in written format how they can maintain it as well. This is one way of dealing with the loophole that is there. Subsequent to that, the seller of the boat would have no responsibility beyond that, because of course, what could they do at that point?

This is really addressing a critical loophole that was created when we introduced the prohibition of abandoning boats. This is something that we need to do to close that loophole.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his work and for his speech. We will indeed be able to work across party lines on this bill.

My question concerns one of the clauses. The bill, which is fairly specific and targeted, includes four clauses. One of the clauses amends the Canadian Environmental Protection Act prohibition that no person may dispose of a substance in the sea, which encompasses the sinking of ships, by adding “or allow the disposal” of a substance in the sea.

What purpose does this addition to the act serve?

Patrick Weiler: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I enjoy working with him on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

This amendment seeks to correct a problem created by a court decision. The penalty and the prohibition were always intended as a strict liability offence. The court's interpretation of the law altered its application. This amendment restores the original intent: Any act committed deliberately or by negligence will henceforward be prohibited.

• (1825)

[English]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, coastal communities across Canada see the impact of pollution and the dangers of wrecked and abandoned vessels all too often. The legislation would have a positive impact from my coast in Atlantic Canada to his on the west coast.

I would like to know how coastal communities, especially in his province of British Columbia, have responded to the measures proposed in the bill.

Patrick Weiler: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my speech that this is something that requires multiple levels of government jurisdiction to address. The province has taken some actions, as well, to deal with marine pollution. It is very much something that we can work together on. We all realize that this is an issue. If it is in the water, it is typically the federal government's jurisdiction. When it washes ashore to land, we engage the provincial jurisdiction. We need to work closely together.

This is about getting ahead of those problems and stopping the issue from getting worse, stopping more and more derelict vessels from being out there. It is also about making sure that we are holding the folks and companies that are causing marine pollution responsible.

That is something that all levels of government and all members of the House should be able to agree to, because this is about a core value, personal responsibility, and ensuring that the polluter pays for actions.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member across the floor for this bill, Bill C-244, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act.

I come from Kitamaat Village, which is at the head of the Douglas Channel on the west coast of British Columbia. I grew up around marine activities, hunting and fishing, but there was no recreation. We have had a private port for the last 70 years, but apart from the pulp and paper tankers, the aluminum tankers carrying bauxite and ore and those carrying methanol, we have not really seen marine activity or even been part of it, for that matter.

As a small first nation community, we were trying to deal not only with derelict vessels sinking, but with the topics the member just talked about, such as spill response. More deeply, we went into industrial degradation with air, land and water. The more we dug into it, dating back to the 1970s, the more we realized that regulations and legislation had empty promises. They were not really living up to the limitations that had been put on by the permits and the regulators, whether it be in Canada or B.C.

In fact, by the time we got to the consultation in 2003, we realized that permits were basically rules to be broken. If a company could not abide by the limits put on it by a permit, the permit limitations would be expanded. We fought really hard to get the provincial government and the federal government to live up to the regulations and permitting requirements. In some cases we succeeded and in some we did not.

It was not until we started to engage fully in environmental assessments by Canada and B.C. that we realized we could kill two birds with one stone. We could make the standards for environmental protection higher for marine, terrestrial and air, not only in the environmental assessment process but within existing permits.

Being a small community, we still deal with vessels sinking today, not only in the Douglas Channel but also at our docks. The dock we are talking about in my village is actually owned by the federal government under the small harbours act. We really thought the existing regulations were going to not only help prevent vessels from sinking, but also help us remediate and get these vessels to stop polluting our waters. That was not the case.

When we look at some of the existing processes, such as the oceans protection plan the member mentioned, the \$300 million that was earmarked for the oceans protection plan has removed 791 vessels to date to get the polluting factor out of our marine environment. However, there are still 1,355 derelict vessels on the list from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans that are backlogged. We still have a long way to go. When we think about that and quantify it, with upwards of \$300 million for these vessels, we need a better way to implement and enforce the existing regulations. We have to make it easier.

I agree with the member that it has to be a coordinated effort among the provincial government, the federal government, the municipalities and first nations, which are burdened with the cost and the pollution we are talking about. It is first nations like my band that struggle with this cost and with trying to figure it out. We had the same problems the member talked about. We had a problem with ownership and trying to track down who the owners were, to try to offset some of the costs the council was paying out.

• (1830)

At that time, we had no money. We were broke. We were trying to find some way within our Indian Act agreement to pay for these derelict vessels, not only to take them out of the water but also to clean up the damage. That is really hard to do when there is no money. Most of the time we had to let these vessels just sit there until we could figure out a way to keep them from being a risk, let alone trying to clean up the damage.

The intent of the bill is good. First nations and non-first nations all want to see a cleaner environment, whether it be terrestrial or marine. In fact, the record in my community over the last 20 years reflects that in all categories, whether we are talking about dumps or marine spills. During the preliminary oil and gas days, for proposals in our territory, we tried to engage with the idea of getting involved with the spill response. We wanted to be partners with Canada and B.C. to be the first responders in case of a spill, whether it came from industrial activity or residential activity, even on the highways, or even sewage.

Sewage is a big issue on the west coast of British Columbia. Prince Rupert, for example, has been begging the provincial and federal governments for some help because they have no primary treatment of their sewage. It goes directly into the ocean. They are under threat of fines coming from the provincial government. At the same time, Prince Rupert does not have the funds to provide clean drinking water to its citizens. They are in a really tough spot.

I grew up on the water, purchasing boats on my own behalf, as well as for friends and family. It is an interesting concept to say that the onus should be on the seller to basically ensure the new owner or prospective buyer has the ability, resources or intent to own a boat, and that before the buyer can purchase a boat, the owner has to ensure that prospective buyer has the ability, resources or intent to manage a boat. That is an interesting concept.

I do not know how that would be done. Are they interviewed? Is a credit check done? Is their bank account checked? I do not know how a buyer would ensure that the new owner could actually maintain a boat. We do not do that with vehicles or anything else. It is going to be interesting to see how the government or the regulator would ensure that that happens. I can see it being a legal mess. I can see it going before the courts. Unless there are some provisions that would come out in the regulations later to show the steps that a seller would have to take to ensure that the buyer is not reckless.

By the way, a lot of boats purchased in Canada come from the United States. That presents different problems. There are already different rules to be followed when purchasing boats from the United States. Now the seller in the United States would have obligations when selling a boat to someone living in Canada. That becomes a different issue altogether.

Private Members' Business

Canada is actually a seller of boats. British Columbia is a seller of boats. It is mostly done through surplus auctions. Canada would be in the same boat—

• (1835)

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his Bill C-244, which will allow us to address an important topic.

When we leave dry land and set sail, the ship that carries us transports us to another world. Things are different at sea. The horizon stretches out all around us, the air is salty, and the sky is vast. Boats are a gateway to other places, but they do not last forever. Boats wear out, break down, sometimes run aground and become wrecks. Sometimes boats are abandoned.

In Canada, there are thousands of abandoned boats. Some are still afloat, moored like ghost ships in ports. Others have already sunk and become wrecks. What do we do with these abandoned boats? They pose a clear environmental risk. I would like to tell the story of the *Corfu Island* that unfolded in my riding, the beautiful Magdalen Islands, to give members an idea of what we are talking about today.

The *SS Corfu Island* ran aground on December 20, 1963, on the West Dune of Cap aux Meules Island, in the L'Étang-du-Nord sector, with 27 Greek sailors on board. It was December and there was an intense blizzard. Through courage, ingenuity and islander rescuers' desire to help, tragedy was averted. In the end, all the sailors were rescued, but the *Corfu Island* became a wreck filled with heavy oil.

In 1966, three years after the shipwreck, a Quebec City company won the contract to demolish the hull of the *Corfu Island* and send it to the scrapyards. However, executing the contract proved difficult. The hull refused to slide easily enough, and the wreck had to be cut up, but only the part that was above the sandy section could be cut up. To this day, about 10 feet of the ship remains stuck in the sand dune, on the Magdalen Islands, on what is now known as Corfu beach.

The wreck is subject to shifting sands, which sometimes exposes small, sharp metal parts, and has recently caused oil spills. Two of those oil spills happened this summer, in August. They were minor, at roughly 500 millilitres, but still. For the people of the islands, who love their natural environment so much, seeing small traces of oil in the sea is worrisome and troubling.

Private Members' Business

Since 1996, 186 operations have been carried out to recover oil from the *Corfu Island*. Since 2015, 200 litres of oil have been recovered, but some still remains. The Canadian Coast Guard is now in charge of the wreck and believes that it poses little risk to the environment and the population but remains dangerous to visitors. The question Magdalen Islanders are asking is: What are they going to do with the rest of the *Corfu Island*? It is not a pretty sight. It is the remains of a wreck stuck in the sand on the Magdalen Islands. The Coast Guard says it cannot get rid of it until it can ensure that the benefits of removing it outweigh the environmental risks associated with the operation. That is where things stand. I am still getting emails from Magdalen Islanders who want to know what is going on with the *Corfu Island*.

In short, the archipelago is still dealing with this ship 62 years after it ran aground. This story shows that abandoned vessels are a major problem that needs to be better managed. Tracking down the owners is often difficult. The cost of removing vessels is often too high. Public funds are available to help, but it is insufficient given the number of vessels that need to be removed. These vessels also pose risks to maritime safety when they are in shipping lanes. They also pose environmental risks, given the oil leaks that can occur, as we have seen.

How do we make sure that what happened with *Corfu Island* does not happen again? I think Bill C-244 is a partial attempt to answer that question, and that is why the Bloc Québécois supports it and will be voting in favour.

• (1840)

Bill C-244 seeks to amend two laws, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act, to enhance the protection of marine areas by providing for increased liability for damage to marine areas. That means the owners' liability.

The first proposed change would amend the provision that says "no person or ship shall dispose of a substance" to add "or allow the disposal of". This may seem like gibberish, so I will provide some context for those tuning in. Under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the term "disposal" means the disposal of a substance at sea from a ship, an aircraft, a platform or another structure.

The proposed amendment clarifies that it is not only illegal for a person who owns a vessel to simply sink it and pollute the area, but it is also illegal for someone to allow another person to do so. The explanation I received from my colleague was that this change was in response to a court ruling. Basically, that is how it works. When this situation arises, it constitutes a criminal offence and the offender ends up in court.

Someone argued that, under this provision, a degree of intent was needed for the person to be found criminally responsible. This amendment is intended to close that loophole. If it does indeed close it, I totally support it. However, when I read the clause, I am not sure I understand that this is what it does. I will have questions to ask about the clause and its effect.

The Bloc Québécois supports the idea of making it easier to prosecute someone who deliberately sinks a vessel or is complicit

in deliberately sinking a vessel. Basically, by broadening our powers and being more vigilant, we can avoid creating problems that will last for decades. Once a vessel is abandoned and sunk, it takes decades to get rid of it, and sometimes that cannot even be done.

Another of this bill's improvements is to amend the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act by proposing a new section 34.1 concerning transfer of ownership. It clarifies that owners of a vessel will now be prohibited from selling the vessel to someone knowing that this person lacks the ability, resources or intent to maintain, operate or dispose of the vessel in a manner that prevents it from becoming wrecked or abandoned. The bill goes even further by stating that not only may the vessel not be sold if the owner knows that the buyer lacks the resources to look after it, but neither may it be sold if the owner is reckless as to whether the buyer has the ability to look after it.

That is interesting. Cases like these have been documented before. A broken-down ship is a whole lot of trouble. The owner has to find some way to offload it. It can be tempting to simply sell it off cheap to someone who will make the best of it or use it for shelter. That has happened before in some places on the west coast.

Now, a seller would be required to ensure that a buyer has the ability to properly care for the vessel. How are they supposed to do that? That is something the committee will have to discuss. What will be expected of the seller? How far would they have to go? Should they ask for bank statements? How do they know someone has the ability to care for a vessel? Those are very relevant questions. How long will they be responsible? My colleague actually answered that question earlier. That is a question the seller has to ask. If someone sells a vessel and the buyer appears to be solvent and responsible, but then sinks the vessel six months later, can the seller still be held responsible? Those are questions worth asking.

I would reiterate that we agree with the principle. We want to prevent the transfer of property that ends up being yet another wreck.

In closing, I believe we must act to prevent yet more wrecks from polluting our coasts. Let us ensure that the *Corfu Island* is the last of its kind.

• (1845)

[English]

Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to this private member's bill, Bill C-244, the clean coasts act, introduced by the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country. At its core, Bill C-244 aims to provide a tool to ensure that those who benefit from Canada's waterways must also take responsibility for their use and for the safe end-of-life management of their vessels.

Bill C-244 proposes amendments to two important pieces of federal legislation: the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999; and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act. The proposed amendment to the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act would prohibit vessel owners from transferring their vessels to individuals who do not intend to maintain, operate or dispose of them responsibly.

The intent of the bill, as outlined by the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, is to ensure that when vessels are passed from one owner to another, they are not neglected to the point that they are abandoned, wrecked or hazardous. For those in coastal communities, we know this can pollute our waters and create hazards for Canadians.

Canadians are proud stewards of our coasts, lakes and rivers. Navigation is a right that has helped shape our economy, our communities and our identity. However, with that right comes a responsibility to do the right thing when vessels have reached the end of their life.

While the vast majority of vessel owners take this duty seriously, there are instances, which are too frequent and too visible, where individuals choose to abandon vessels rather than dispose of them properly. Across Canada, more than 1,300 vessels have been identified as wrecked, abandoned or hazardous. Many of these vessels no longer have known owners.

When ownership cannot be traced, the burden falls on taxpayers and communities to address the environmental and safety risks. These risks can include leaking fuel, sinking hulls, navigational hazards, and impacts on fish and wildlife habitats. This issue affects communities in all regions, along the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, across the north, in inland lakes, along the St. Lawrence Seaway and in the Great Lakes. It is a national challenge with local consequences.

Marine areas carry deep cultural, spiritual and historical significance, especially for indigenous communities that have navigated, harvested and lived along these waters since time immemorial. Abandoned vessels harm ecosystems and can also disturb culturally significant sites, archaeological resources and areas of traditional use. For these reasons, the government has made addressing problem vessels a priority for several years. The approach has been centred on prevention, preparedness and accountability, while recognizing community realities and cultural context.

A key step in this effort came with the launch, in November 2016, of the national strategy to address Canada's wrecked and abandoned vessels. That strategy was designed to reduce the prevalence of problem vessels, prevent new ones, and support responsible owners and safe disposal.

One of the pillars of the national strategy was the creation of the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act, or WAHVA, which came into force in July 2019 with the support of all parties in the House. WAHVA made it illegal to abandon a vessel in Canadian waters, strengthened enforcement powers and introduced new penalties. It reinforced the principle that the polluter, not the public, should pay.

Private Members' Business

In parallel, under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, or CEPA, the government administers the disposal at sea program, which regulates the disposal of substances at sea through a strict permit system and allows Canada to meet its international obligations under the London Convention and the London Protocol.

This program authorizes a limited set of materials for disposal at sea only after an assessment of risk and under strict environmental conditions. The program issues approximately 80 to 100 permits per year, and it conducts monitoring to ensure compliance and protect sensitive marine ecosystems. These efforts form part of Canada's broader commitment to environmental protection, including through CEPA and its core principles, notably precaution, polluter pays and pollution prevention.

• (1850)

While the government has created a solid foundation of legislation, programs and partnerships, experience has also revealed gaps, especially related to vessel transfers and end-of-life management. Many vessels still change hands repeatedly, often among parties unable or unwilling to manage them. Ultimately, the costs and risks land on coastal communities, harbour authorities, indigenous governments and taxpayers. The bill proposes to prevent the transfer of vessels to individuals who lack the capacity or intent to manage them responsibly, and to place the responsibility with owners.

Work is already under way to modernize Canada's approach to vessel ownership. Measures include updating vessel registration and licensing rules so ownership information stays current; requiring faster registration of transferred vessels, which will help trace responsibility; developing an owner-financed cleanup fund, creating a sustainable source of funding for removals when owners cannot be identified or cannot pay; maintaining a national inventory of vessels of concern to support enforcement and planning; and supporting removal and disposal efforts through programs such as the abandoned boats program and Fisheries and Oceans Canada's small craft harbours abandoned and wrecked vessels removal program.

These tools are important; they mean that Transport Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard can work together more effectively to hold owners accountable and prevent abandoned vessels from accumulating in communities and waterways. However, as parliamentarians have heard from coastal residents, harbour operators and indigenous partners, more can be done to address the causes of vessel abandonment.

Private Members' Business

Bill C-244 proposes to discourage irresponsible transfers, support the polluter-pays principle, and build a more responsible marine ownership culture. Some may ask why this issue matters when many Canadians never encounter abandoned boats. For those who live in coastal regions, particularly in British Columbia, as my colleague pointed out, the problem is highly visible. Vessels left to decay near marinas, anchorages or beaches are more than an eyesore; they represent environmental degradation, lost economic opportunity and an unfair burden on communities.

Beyond local impacts, there is a national interest. Abandoned vessels create navigational hazards, interfere with safe commercial and recreational boating, and cost significant public funds to remove. The challenge will only grow as fleets age, as the resale market grows online and as climate change increases the risks associated with damaged vessels from extreme weather.

Parliament has already demonstrated a shared commitment to addressing the issue. The unanimous passage of WAHVA in 2019 reflects a consensus that abandoned vessels do not belong in Canadian waters and that owners must be accountable. Addressing wrecked and abandoned vessels is long-term work. The national strategy has already laid the important groundwork: a modern legislative framework, a national inventory, improved owner identification processes and federal programs to assist communities. Regulations to support a dedicated removal fund are under way.

I would like to thank the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country for his long-standing advocacy for coastal protection and for bringing forward the proposed legislation, Bill C-244, and the ways it will help strengthen prevention.

• (1855)

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today as the representative for Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, a riding that stretches from the continental divide in Yoho National Park, through the lakes and highlands of the Shuswap, to the grasslands of Kamloops.

Today I rise to speak to Bill C-244, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act. I thank the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, for bringing it forward. I have the pleasure of serving on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans with the hon. member, and I know that marine protection is a matter that is important to him and to the Canadians he represents.

Protecting Canada's waters and aquatic habitats is a priority that my constituents across Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies and I share with Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Having spent decades working with grassroots conservation organizations, I have experienced first-hand the value and importance of our waters. They are essential for aquatic species and wildlife, for biodiversity and for all Canadians who depend on fisheries and marine resources for food, livelihood and recreation. Our waters are also essential to our survival, and conserving our pristine waters is a priority we all can agree on.

As I mentioned, the sponsor of the bill and I serve on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, FOPO. On October 22,

2025, our committee tabled a report on the issue of derelict and abandoned vessels. The study was initiated in the 44th Parliament. During the study, multiple witnesses, including government officials, described difficulties in dealing with derelict and abandoned vessels, DAVs, because authorities are unable to identify the current owners of vessels.

I encourage everyone to read the report in order to better understand the challenge of DAVs, and I especially encourage them to read the Conservative supplemental report, which contains recommendations for a workable solution to the vessel registry issue.

Transport Canada operates a pleasure craft licence database, but transfers of ownership are not consistently reported to that database, so a vessel can change hands, sometimes multiple times, and the Transport Canada database does not reflect the changes in ownership if the transfers are not reported and the new owners fail to register vessels after purchase. This causes a major blind spot for enforcement of the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act and regulations that flow from the act. Laws and regulations are in place, but enforcement of the laws and regulations is not possible when the current owner of a vessel cannot be identified.

Testimony that FOPO received from Transport Canada officials stated that regulatory changes related to the requirements for registering a transfer of vessel ownership are pending, but it is unclear what those changes will be. Will the regulatory amendments place the onus to report the transfer of vessel ownership on the buyer or on the seller of a vessel?

This is a very important question, because if the current owner of a vessel that is causing pollution or poses a threat to polluting waters cannot be identified, it is impossible to enforce laws and regulations that uphold the polluter pays principle, which is the current principle in federal statutes aimed at preventing and prohibiting pollution of our waters. The principle of polluter pays is essential to the sound policy to protect our environment, especially our waters and aquatic habitats.

In 2015, the Harper government formally established the polluter pays principle in legislation, through the Pipeline Safety Act, which enshrined the principle in law. The government also incorporated the polluter pays principle into other legislation, such as the Energy Safety and Security Act and international agreements. Conservatives also strengthened the polluter pays principle for the marine environment by introducing legislative and regulatory amendments for enhancing Canada's domestic ship-source oil pollution fund.

● (1900)

Since then, the Liberal government has taken additional steps to expand the application of this essential principle but, as I stated, when it comes to derelict and abandoned vessels, enforcement officials must know who the culpable party is before they can make a polluter pay. I certainly hope this blind spot for enforcement authorities is quickly dealt with in an effective manner.

Clause 3 of the bill proposes a prohibition related to the transfer of vessel ownership, specifically:

It is prohibited for an owner of a vessel to transfer ownership of it to a person, if the owner knows that — or is reckless as to whether — the person lacks the ability, resources or intent to maintain, operate or dispose of the vessel in a manner that prevents it from becoming wrecked, abandoned or hazardous.

I appreciate the intention of the bill, which I believe to be the prevention of pollution. That is an objective that we can all hopefully agree is worthwhile. However, I do have questions regarding the proposals of clause 3 that I just quoted.

For instance, how can a person who is transferring a vessel determine if the person acquiring the vessel is fit to care for the vessel? Similarly, in enforcement, how could the applicable enforcement authorities determine and prove that someone transferred ownership to someone unfit to care for a vessel knowing that or was reckless as to whether the person who acquired the vessel was unfit to care for it?

Does the sponsor of the bill envision sellers of vessels requesting financial statements from the prospective buyers or enforcement officials pressing the seller of a vessel as to whether the seller had compelled a buyer to produce financial statements demonstrating the means to care for the vessel in question? What about in an on-line auction sale, a more and more common channel for the sale of used vessels? For what length of time would the liability exist for the seller? How long would it go on after the sale?

I would also like to hear from my colleague who has sponsored the bill, who I know has a background in law, whether the proposals of clause 3 would be best delivered as a legislative or regulatory change.

From my previous occupation in the marine sector, I have seen the root causes for failures of the existing vessel registration system, which the government has failed to correct in any of the changes they have attempted over the years. This is the first hour of second reading, and I know that we have more debate ahead of us, so I hope the hon. member might be able to provide some clarity on these points.

Clause 2 of the bill states, “No person or ship shall dispose or allow the disposal of a substance in an area of the sea referred to in any of paragraphs 122(2)(a) to (e) unless”.

Regarding the part of the proposal that states “or allow the disposal of a substance”, it is unclear to me what kind of scenarios this proposal seeks to prohibit. Would the proposal establish an obligation, responsibility or duty for persons who witness a disposal occurring to intervene? For instance, if a recreational boater witnesses the disposal of a substance coming from a commercial cargo vessel in an area described, and that boater does not intervene, is that boater allowing the disposal by not intervening?

Adjournment Proceedings

Again, today's debate is the preliminary stage of the bill's progression in the legislative process. I hope the sponsor, my hon. colleague, can further illuminate the proposals of the bill that he has sponsored. There are many questions I have about the bill as it moves forward, if it moves forward past the second reading stage.

As I stated, in my experience in the marine sector, I have witnessed boats being sold, re-sold, and re-sold to the point where it is impossible to find one's way back to who originally owned the vessel. I believe the answer to that is in the recommendations in the Conservative supplemental report that I mentioned earlier in my speech, and that would be to place the onus on the seller to simply report the sale of the vessel.

● (1905)

By placing the onus on the buyer, they take on a liability by reporting the purchase, the first liability being taxes. I have witnessed that. As a vessel buyer, if they register a vessel, the first thing that happens is they get a letter from the tax collector to make sure provincial taxes and the GST have been paid. It is a deterrent for buyers to report the sale. It is far better if the seller reports it and a small fine be paid if they do not.

[*Translation*]

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly disappointed this week to see that the Liberals' budget contains absolutely no jobs plan. The situation right now is very dire as it relates to unemployment, particularly unemployment for youth. As members know by now, as I have said it many times, we are in a situation where youth unemployment is at 14.7%, approaching 15%. Close to half a million young people between the ages of 15 and 24 are unemployed. We have the worst employment numbers in over 25 years, yet budget 2025 has absolutely no jobs plan.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Conservatives put forward constructive proposals in the lead-up to the release of the budget as part of the Conservative youth jobs plan. We proposed measures to unleash the economy, to fix immigration, to fix training and to build homes where the jobs are. Instead, what we see from this budget is more of the same bad Liberal policies that got into this mess in the first place. We see a budget deficit of over \$78 billion; the continuation of policies that constrain the growth of our economy, deter investment, fail to unleash our economy and make it harder for our economy to move forward; a doubling down on failure in many areas; and a failure to implement the proposals we put forward, which would have created jobs and opportunities.

The best the Liberals could do is announce the continuing existence of programs that have been in place since the 1990s. What we hear when discussing unemployment is government members say they have this strategy and that program. Those programs have been in place since the 1990s, and the Liberals have no new ideas. They are clearly not delivering the goods.

What matters when it comes to unemployment is the result, not the good intention of politicians and not the existence of programs or the expenditure on those programs. What matters is whether young people are working. Tragically, the situation right now, as a result of 10 years of bad Liberal policies, is that we have the worst employment numbers in over 25 years.

I will note that frequently the Liberals' response is that they have the Canada summer jobs program, a program that has existed since the 1990s. The Canada summer jobs program provides jobs, on average, for eight weeks. When we have a crisis of almost half a million young people who are unemployed and we say we are going to subsidize a few more eight-week jobs, that is clearly not a solution that meets the moment, that meets the magnitude of the crisis.

The Conservatives have mapped out a clear plan to get us there. We put forward the Conservative youth jobs plan in hopes that the Liberals would include parts of it in their budget, that they would borrow our good ideas around unleashing the economy, fixing immigration, fixing training and building homes where the jobs are. However, the Liberals chose not to implement those ideas and not to come up with any new ideas of their own. Instead, they put forward a budget with no youth jobs plan. It simply identifies the continuing existence of a few programs that have been in place since the 1990s.

Why did the Liberals not take this opportunity to use our good ideas to confront youth unemployment and put them in the budget?

• (1910)

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to engage in debate, particularly with this member, whom I have now known for the better part of 10 years. I respect his passion, and I say that sincerely.

I know he is a student of many, and Milton Friedman would be counted on that list. I say that because he said that intention does not matter, outcome matters. That is what Milton Friedman had argued. I would go for that. I am not particularly partial to the arguments of Milton Friedman, although he had some very interesting

points to make from time to time. I think Keynes is more interesting, for example, but I digress.

The member talks about outcomes being especially important. Okay, that is fine, but ideas matter too. The colleague spent his entire speech talking about the 1990s, talking about the past. We should be focused on the present and the future. In the 1990s, I was in elementary school. I am not sure my colleague was even born yet, and I say that as a compliment. The point is, if he has ideas to put on the floor of the House of Commons, he should do so. I would be interested, and I say that very sincerely.

What I see, though, and this relates to outcomes, of course, is a Conservative Party that, faced with a budget that happens to hold the potential to transform this country for the better, is going to oppose it. This is a budget that helps to, among other things, build up the country in terms of infrastructure and more homebuilding.

We need more non-market housing, in particular. We will rely on the private sector to get those homes built, but in a way that matches with the needs of the moment. Non-market housing is essential to that, whether it is non-market housing with wraparound supports on site to ensure that those who are on the street are uplifted, those who are on the street dealing with addiction and other challenges related to alcoholism. There are many examples we could give here. Wraparound supports are critical in that. Not-for-profits are ready to continue to respond to the challenge. Housing with rent geared to income is another example.

Regardless of the form it takes, we can rely on skilled tradespeople, including young people, to help build those homes.

On the defence sector, I come from southwestern Ontario, a crucial area when it comes to this country and its defence sector. We have a number of companies that are specifically and directly involved with providing military equipment for democracies around the world, including the Canadian government. This budget holds the potential to unleash building in that area. That is only good for the economy. Young people want to see that too.

The member talks about EI. He talks about training programs. I have to say that at every opportunity, when the federal government of the past and this government now have put forward measures to help working people, to help deal with the trade issues we have, the Conservative Party has stood against that. I will give an example. We put forward EI measures to help, in a very targeted way, tariff-impacted sectors and workers. The Conservatives have either been silent or not supportive when they have spoken up.

Adjournment Proceedings

I have a hard time understanding that. The Conservative Party champions itself, all of a sudden now, as a party of the working class. If we scratch the surface, we see a party that is anti-union and anti-worker. I will not say anti-youth, because I know they care about young people, but they do not have the ideas. Where are those vital ideas to help advance the cause, the needs, the interests of young people? They are not there.

Finally, we are talking about young people, but we also need to talk about young families and the Canada child benefit that, since 2015, has helped to uplift no less than 650,000 kids out of poverty. The Conservative Party has not supported it a single time. I do not understand why.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, a lot of what the member said really had nothing to do with the question that was asked.

I have highlighted our Conservative youth jobs plan, a constructive proposal around unleashing the economy, fixing immigration, fixing training and building homes where the jobs are, and I highlighted that this budget simply has no jobs plan. We would have liked to see the Liberals adopt our plan.

It is interesting that the parliamentary secretary for immigration is here tonight. We have repeatedly heard, at the human resources committee, about the link between failed Liberal immigration policies and unemployment. In fact, the budget uses language that almost seems to admit that Liberal immigration policies over the last 10 years have been profoundly ineffective and, really, have undermined the consensus we had on immigration prior to that.

I want to ask the member a simple question about his portfolio. Does the member agree that Liberal policies on immigration were a contributing factor to the high levels of youth unemployment we face?

• (1915)

Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, my friend accuses me of not answering the question, but his question was all over the place. I am not sure what exactly he was talking about.

I am genuinely very interested in the youth employment plan of the Conservatives. I will look it up, but we do not know about it. Perhaps some of us do, but I think I follow things pretty closely, and I have not seen it.

As far as the immigration policy of the government goes, the member is stuck in the past. He continues to talk about the Trudeau years. This will be a common refrain, I am afraid, from the Conservatives in the coming weeks, months and years: to keep talking about Justin Trudeau.

We are focused on the present and the future. Yesterday's immigration levels plan speaks to that. It is immigration policy that is also economic policy at the same time. Sixty-four per cent of immigrants who will be here in Canada will be here helping build up the economy. That is an increase from 59%. Researchers are going to be coming.

The Conservatives have made temporary workers their only issue. Their big, bold idea is to get rid of a program that sustains, in many ways, businesses in remote communities—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for York—Durham has the floor.

HOUSING

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is budget week here in Parliament. I have been poring over the budget on the issue of housing. As members know, I have risen on this topic again and again, and I will continue to do so until I see movement from the Liberal government that will actually get homes to the next generation.

Unfortunately, however, this budget is an unmitigated disaster when it comes to housing and homes. Let us take stock of some of what experts are saying. The Canadian Home Builders Association says, “Federal budget fails to support home ownership for next generation” and “Despite urgent calls for action, the budget presented no new measures to address housing affordability for the average Canadian who still wants to become a homeowner.”

The Large Urban Centre Alliance says, “What was once a promise to deliver 500,000 new homes annually has now become a plan that will cost 100,000 jobs.” Last, the Building Industry and Land Development association says the budget “missed an opportunity to address the historic downturn [in] the housing industry” and that it “relies on backward-looking data that provides false reassurances that Canada’s housing sector is prospering and that affordability is improving.”

People do not have to take my word for it; these are the experts who can tell us how this budget will play out.

It is not a surprise, because the Liberals have already abandoned every promise they made just six months ago during the election. In their platform, they promised to cut municipal development charges in half. What does the budget say about them? Now it is a hope and a prayer to maybe reduce them, by frameworks for federal, provincial and territorial agreements. I do not know what those are. Maybe the parliamentary secretary can enlighten us.

The second promise was the multi-unit residential building incentive that was pitched as a fabulous idea to bring about thousands of new units. Where is it in the budget? I do not know, because it is not there. Last, the Liberals promised to publicly report on municipalities' progress to speed up permitting and approvals. Again, that is not in the budget.

The dream of home ownership is slipping away and being replaced with the lie that the next generation must settle for less. I want the next generation of Canadians to know that I reject this lie. They deserve the opportunity to have a home and start a family, just as their parents and grandparents did before them.

Will the parliamentary secretary agree with me that we need to build homes, not bureaucracy, and targets for municipalities, bringing down development targets, bringing down development charges and getting homes to the next generation?

Adjournment Proceedings

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite, a fellow Durham region MP, for the question. The Government of Canada is focused on delivering change and ensuring that the country's housing system works for everyone. We know many Canadians are struggling to get ahead and buy their first home. Budget 2025, Canada strong, is making generational investments of \$25 billion over five years for housing and \$115 billion over five years for infrastructure. These strategic investments will build major infrastructure and homes and create lasting prosperity, empowering Canadians to get ahead.

We are working in collaboration with provinces, territories, municipalities and indigenous communities to build a stronger economy, lower housing costs and make life more affordable for Canadian families. To help new homebuyers enter the market, we are delivering savings of up to \$50,000 for first-time homebuyers by cutting the GST on new homes at or under \$1 million and lowering the GST on new homes between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. To eliminate barriers to development and build more homes faster, the Government of Canada has invested \$4.4 billion in the housing accelerator fund. Over 240 communities across the country are benefiting from this funding and implementing changes that will help us grow the supply of housing faster.

We are also working alongside provinces, territories and municipalities to invest in critical infrastructure that is needed to support growing communities. These initiatives are complemented by the recent launch of Build Canada Homes, the government's bold new approach to building affordable housing. This new federal agency will finance and build affordable housing at scale and deploy modern methods of construction to catalyze a more productive homebuilding industry. It will leverage public lands, offer flexible financial incentives, attract private capital, facilitate large portfolio projects and support manufacturers to build the homes that Canadians need.

Build Canada Homes will focus on catalyzing a new Canadian housing industry, one that builds faster and more sustainably. It will help generate demand for innovative and sustainable building methods, like factory-built and prefabricated construction, helping industry scale up and strengthen supply chains.

Moving forward, we will continue to identify and implement innovative solutions to build more homes faster for Canadians. We will strengthen our relationships with key stakeholders and continue to leverage a team Canada approach with our municipal, provincial, territorial and indigenous partners. Together with our partners, we will develop innovative programs and take targeted action to increase housing supply, lower housing costs and transform the housing sector.

• (1920)

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, if spending money and bureaucracies built homes, every Canadian would have a home right now. We have had 10 years of that. We have had three housing bureaucracies, and now we have a fourth. These Monopoly men handing out billions here and there have not resulted in one more person having a home in Canada.

I am glad the parliamentary secretary brought up modular and new forms of construction, because I have a question for her on that. In the budget, it says, "Build Canada Homes will identify Design-Build teams with proven expertise in factory-built housing and other modern methods of construction".

Will she commit, and confirm for the House, that no Brookfield entity, not Modulaire Group, not Yes Communities, which it may acquire, not any entity affiliated with Brookfield or any investment the Prime Minister has in the real estate space, will get government money to build homes with this bureaucracy?

Jennifer McKelvie: Mr. Speaker, Build Canada Homes is focused on building affordable housing at scale. Through this newly launched agency, Build Canada Homes, we are taking a team Canada approach and strengthening our relationships with key partners in the housing sector. This government will leverage every tool at its disposal to address our country's housing crisis, deliver on our ambitious housing agenda and make housing more affordable and attainable for all Canadians.

We are also helping new homebuyers enter the market by helping make home ownership more affordable, including by eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes at or under \$1 million and lowering the GST for new homes between \$1 million and \$1.5 million.

These measures are all part of our bold approach to build the homes that Canadians need.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising in debate this evening to raise a question that I initially raised a number of months ago about a decision that is somewhat murky in its content. I have been trying to determine from the government for some time exactly if a decision was made to ban the band Kneecap. This is a question that I think some Canadians will have seen in the media. It attracted a lot of controversy.

Adjournment Proceedings

This Irish band was apparently told it could not enter Canada. Although we do not have a clear decision chronology as to how the decision was made and how it was communicated to the band, it was certainly in the media that this band was alleged to have views that were unacceptable and was refused entry to Canada. It is not clear how this was decided or if, in fact, it was decided. That is why I pursued the matter with the Minister of Immigration in this place. Her position was that no particular case could be discussed, obviously for reasons of privacy.

This band had attracted attention in other parts of the world and was quite clear in saying there was no evidence whatsoever that it had ever supported Hamas or Hezbollah, and that the allegations to that effect were unfounded, incorrect and maligned the band's reputation. Meanwhile, the band also said it had not exactly been told by anyone in Canada that it was not welcome, but had merely seen the media coverage.

It is a long time ago now, as we are absorbed for obvious reasons in more recent issues, such as the budget that came down two days ago. We have lots of things on our mind. However, the fundamental principles of the rule of law honoured by this country, our commitment to human rights and our commitment to free speech should not be something that is questioned by an incident.

I admit that the name Kneecap only reminds me of having knee replacements, which is not something I would like to revisit. In any case, I think any artistic enterprise should be welcomed into Canada. On scanty evidence that the band disputes, I am wondering if the Government of Canada itself made a decision to ban this band from touring Canada. If so, the evidence should be available for parliamentary review. Did the decision get made within Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada or was it, as I asked in my question, that at least one member of the Liberal caucus said that this particular musical group had been banned? The minister did not confirm that.

I do not need to belabour it. I know the parliamentary secretary is waiting to respond. I really am, in tonight's session of Adjournment Proceedings, seeking clarity. I do not have an agenda here except to know what decision was made, if it was made properly, if it was made based on evidence that this musical group represented some threat to Canada that was otherwise unacceptable under our values. At a minimum, I would like the House to be told who made the decision and was it made under immigration and refugee laws, as would normally be applied, or was this, as it appeared at the time in the media, potentially one rogue MP who decided to announce it for whatever benefit that might be. Certainly, the issue is highly

charged. Therefore, people might seek to gain advantage one way or the other. I would just like to know what happened.

● (1925)

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows the respect that I and other colleagues hold for her. Of course, she has served this country and never fails to bring up matters that are important to her and her constituents. I understand that very well.

What I would say, and she knows this as well, is that individual cases, for privacy reasons, should not be brought forward on the floor of the House of Commons. She brought it forward, yes, I understand that, but with respect to the response, addressing that would not be appropriate. I will also extend that the authorization of communications relating to individual cases issued by particular departments would also be inappropriate.

My advice to the member, and I say this very respectfully because she has brought up the matter before, is to engage with the relevant departments and seek an answer that way.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for such kind words; they are appreciated.

I will take his advice and pursue it, but I thought that without asking about a specific case, we could at least have clarity on whether there was a case. I do not think that trespasses into discussing a particular case, because at this point, I still do not know, and I do not think any Canadians know, if there was a decision made by the government. It was not communicated to Kneecap.

A yes or no would be lovely. Did the Government of Canada decide not to admit this musical group?

● (1930)

Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, I will, I am afraid, repeat myself. Individual cases are not something I am going to address on the floor of the House of Commons. I am also not going to address the authorizations issued by particular departments. The member is able to contact the relevant departments and seek an answer that way. I invite her to do so if she wishes.

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

(The House adjourned at 7:31 p.m.)

Kronis	3547
Bonk	3547
Blois	3549
Blanchette-Joncas	3549
Aboultaif	3549
Lamoureux	3549
Blois	3550
Bezan	3551
Brunelle-Duceppe	3552
Clark	3552
Nathan	3552

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Habitat for Humanity

Fanjoy	3553
--------------	------

The Budget

Aboultaif	3553
-----------------	------

Award for Teaching Excellence

Clark	3553
-------------	------

Affordability

Aitchison	3553
-----------------	------

ôChampfleury

Leitão	3553
--------------	------

Lorne Benedict Plemel

Block	3554
-------------	------

The Budget

Rochefort	3554
-----------------	------

The Prime Minister

Kuruc	3554
-------------	------

Port of Baie-Comeau

Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3554
---	------

Canadian Music Creator Day

Myles	3555
-------------	------

The Budget

Kirkland	3555
----------------	------

Forestry Sector

Hogan	3555
-------------	------

Mandatory Minimum Sentences

Morrison	3555
----------------	------

Food Drives

Lauzon	3555
--------------	------

The Budget

Cody	3556
------------	------

The Budget

Lamoureux	3556
-----------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Budget

Lantsman	3556
Carney	3556
Lantsman	3556
Carney	3556

The Economy

Berthold	3556
Carney	3556
Berthold	3556
Carney	3557

Ethics

Hallan	3557
Carney	3557
Hallan	3557
Carney	3557

Seniors

Blanchet	3557
Carney	3557

Housing

Blanchet	3557
Carney	3557

Health

Blanchet	3557
Carney	3558

Carbon Pricing

Rood	3558
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	3558
Rood	3558
MacDonald (Malpeque)	3558
Calkins	3558
Olszewski	3558
Calkins	3558
Thompson	3558
Epp	3559
van Koeverden	3559
Epp	3559
Hajdu	3559
McKenzie	3559
Hodgson	3559

The Budget

Garon	3559
Guilbeault	3559

Climate Change

Bonin	3559
Dabrusin	3560

Housing

Aitchison	3560
Zerucelli	3560
Aitchison	3560
Robertson	3560
Cobena	3560
Gainey	3560

Cobena.....	3561
Valdez.....	3561
Finance	
Gill (Brampton West).....	3561
Sahota.....	3561
Housing	
Villeneuve.....	3561
Champagne.....	3561
Finance	
McLean (Calgary Centre).....	3561
McKnight.....	3562
McLean (Calgary Centre).....	3562
McGuinty.....	3562
Carbon Pricing	
Falk (Provencher).....	3562
Fraser.....	3562
Généreux.....	3562
Provost.....	3562
Généreux.....	3562
Michel.....	3563
Taxation	
Lefebvre.....	3563
Gull-Masty.....	3563
Lefebvre.....	3563
Joly.....	3563
Justice	
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk).....	3563
Sahota.....	3563
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk).....	3563
Sahota.....	3563
Telecommunications	
Hirtle.....	3564
Joly.....	3564
Finance	
Morin.....	3564
Fuhr.....	3564
Strauss.....	3564
Alty.....	3564
Reynolds.....	3564
Chartrand.....	3564
Financial Institutions	
St-Pierre.....	3564
Long.....	3565
The Economy	
Rempel Garner.....	3565
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River).....	3565
The Budget	
Kwan.....	3565
Champagne.....	3565
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway).....	3565
Champagne.....	3565

Business of the House	
Scheer.....	3566
MacKinnon.....	3566

Privilege	
Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner— Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker.....	3566

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget	
Financial Statement of Minister of Finance	
Motion.....	3567
Nathan.....	3567
Bailey.....	3568
Larouche.....	3568
Johns.....	3569
Kayabaga.....	3569
Williamson.....	3569
Deschênes-Thériault.....	3570
Larouche.....	3570
Bailey.....	3571
Chenette.....	3571
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt).....	3571
Chenette.....	3572
Deschênes.....	3572
Anderson.....	3573
Mingarelli.....	3573
Deschênes-Thériault.....	3575
Bonin.....	3575
Bailey.....	3575
Miedema.....	3575
Arnold.....	3575
Powlowski.....	3577
Garon.....	3577
Cobena.....	3577
Villeneuve.....	3577
Au.....	3577
Deschênes-Thériault.....	3579
Garon.....	3579
Cobena.....	3579
Lawrence.....	3580
Bains.....	3581
Larouche.....	3581
Calkins.....	3582
Dhaliwal.....	3582
Amendment to the amendment negatived.....	3585

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Clean Coasts Act	
Weiler.....	3585
Bill C-244. Second reading.....	3585
Kibble.....	3587
Deschênes.....	3588

Deschênes-Thériault	3588
Ross	3588
Deschênes	3589
Morrissey	3590
Arnold	3592

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Employment

Genuis	3593
--------------	------

Fragiskatos	3594
-------------------	------

Housing

Mantle	3595
McKelvie	3596

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

May	3596
Fragiskatos	3597

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>