



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 053
Friday, November 7, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 7, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from November 6 consideration of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government, and of the amendment.

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

According to the CIBC's most recent economic flash, Canadian GDP is abysmal. The bank expected a modest acceleration in GDP growth to 1% in the final quarter of the year, but the lack of momentum toward the end of the quarter suggests that not even this anemic goal will be met. This kind of thing has become a standard economic warning bell in Canada these days, with increasing blame for the economic malaise in Canada being put not on sector-specific tariffs by the Americans, but on Canadian government policy.

It is no wonder the Liberals want a Christmas election. They know they cannot keep the bait and switch going with Canadians for very much longer. They want an election before the full weight of their disastrous policies comes crashing down.

We Conservatives consistently try to explain to the Liberals that Canadians want and need jobs and an affordable life. We constantly try to explain that massive deficits, high taxation, onerous regulation and irresponsible spending are at the root of our economic problems, not Donald Trump. Incredibly, the Liberals' response is to boast about government handouts and more bureaucracy. They seem to think that it is quite acceptable to tax and regulate us all into poverty as long as they dribble a little back to some of us. They have the gall to ignore pleas for jobs and answer with boasts about better handouts, and they apparently cannot see the logic of self-sufficiency.

This budget is part of a problem: the Liberal belief that more government, more regulation and more free programs somehow equal prosperity. There is nothing free about any of this. Every free thing the government offers has a cost behind it, every cost has a tax behind it and every new layer of bureaucracy not only costs more, but squeezes the very people who create value in this country.

The Liberals talk about affordability while quietly making everything Canadians buy, build or grow more expensive. They call it compassion; I call it economic vandalism. Now Liberal MPs are publicly mocking the very idea that parents want to be able to afford to feed their own kids rather than accept free handouts from the government. One asked last week where the logic was. Seriously? Where is the logic in wanting to be able to feed our own kids? Where is the logic in wanting to stand proudly self-sufficient instead of relying on Liberal handouts? What is next, soup lines for parents?

This does not sound like a vision for the strongest economy in the G7; it sounds dystopian. It sounds like bread crumbs for the masses while the Prime Minister's rich friends belly up to the Canadian tax trough.

There seems to be a real disconnect between the Liberals and Canadians. Hard-working Canadians want jobs and a thriving economy so they can look after their families, support their communities and help those who truly need it, like seniors on fixed incomes or single parents working two jobs just to stay afloat. I believe that Canadians want government to keep the country safe from outside threats, build conditions for prosperity at home, keep the streets safe and make sure Canadians can walk downtown without fear of harassment. Hard-working Canadians do not mind paying taxes for those things. What they do mind paying for is massive, wasteful bureaucracies built on vote-buying handouts. What they do mind paying for is over-regulation that feeds bureaucrats more than it helps Canadians.

The Budget

Let us look at what is actually happening on the ground. According to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, small firms are suffocating under the cost of Liberal policy. CFIB's most recent research shows that business-operating costs are up 26% since 2017. Everything is more expensive: fuel, energy, insurance and shipping. Two-thirds of small business owners say that rising costs are their top concern. When the people who provide 60% of private sector jobs in this country cannot afford to stay open, that is not just a business problem; it is a national problem.

CFIB also reports that small firms spend about 735 hours a year just on regulator compliance. That is 32 working days, a month and a half, lost to red tape. Here is the kicker: CFIB estimates that \$18 billion of that red tape could vanish tomorrow and no one would even notice. That is enough to pay for safer streets, stronger border enforcement or better health care infrastructure, unless, of course, it disappears into Bermuda.

● (1005)

Into this environment of record costs, ballooning debt and economic uncertainty, the government has brought forward the behemoth of budgets, a budget that makes even Justin Trudeau look like a miser. The new federal budget represents a direct hit on the affordability of life for Canadians. Despite promises of restraint and fiscal responsibility, the government's spending spree is fuelling inflation and driving up prices across the board. Families already struggling to afford groceries, rent and mortgage payments now face even greater pressure as inflationary spending adds \$5,400 per household per year. By running a \$78-billion deficit, far above the \$62-billion pledge, the government has made everyday essentials more expensive, leaving ordinary Canadians to shoulder the burden of its broken promises.

In this budget, hidden food taxes, like the industrial carbon tax, still increase the cost of everything at every stage of production. The energy to grow, harvest, process and transport food is taxed at every step of the way. That means the price increases every step of the way until it reaches the ridiculous price we consumers are used to paying at the checkout stand, or trying to.

While our neighbours to the south embark on aggressive tax restructuring to become competitive, the Liberals are dragging on our economy with hidden taxes and stifling red tape. While the Americans are rapidly reindustrializing, the Liberals are still chasing industries out of Canada with punitive taxation, onerous red tape and accusations of greed whenever a company does manage to succeed in this hostile environment.

While the world is changing before our eyes and other countries are quickly adapting, the Liberal government seems to be stuck in 2015, leisurely taking half-steps and clinging to old ideologies. This budget is just more evidence of the same thing.

The Liberals and their friends, the NDP, blame high prices on corporate greed, but in reality, businesses are simply passing on government greed. When things cost more to make and transport, they cost more at the checkout stand. This is called inflation, and it is caused in part by the industrial gas tax and other hidden taxes like it. It is made worse by the explosion of the expensive bureaucracy the Liberals have embarked on.

Every time the government pats itself on the back for protecting workers but drives employers out of business, it is not helping labour; it is destroying jobs, futures and, in many cases, families. Canadians do not want to be wards of the state. They want the dignity of earning their own way. Young people do not want a low-wage rental economy. They want to own a home someday, like their parents, once they have good jobs and can build an affordable life. They want to know that if they work hard, they can afford to buy a home, start a business and feed their families without waiting for a government cheque.

Conservatives are offering a better path forward: an affordable budget for an affordable life. That means ending hidden taxes that quietly drain household budgets, cutting wasteful government spending and removing the bureaucratic roadblocks that prevent homes from being built. By opening the country to opportunity and rewarding hard work, we can restore hope to families barely getting by. It is time to turn away from generational debt and toward common sense.

Let me return to the question a Liberal MP mockingly asked last week: Where is the logic? Where is the logic in a government that taxes work, punishes success and calls dependency progress? Where is the logic in driving businesses to the brink of insolvency, and then bragging about new programs for the unemployed? Where is the logic in claiming to fight for the middle class while making it impossible for the middle class to even exist?

The Conservatives will continue to fight for real affordability, for policies that empower Canadians to feed their own kids, build their own businesses and stand proudly self-sufficient in a country that rewards work, not dependency.

● (1010)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the month of October, 67,000 jobs were created. Of those jobs, 55,000 were in the province of Ontario.

We have a Prime Minister and a Liberal caucus focused on building Canada strong. On the other hand, we have the extreme Conservative right. Quite frankly, I think Joe Clark said it best when he said that he never left the party; the party left him. Today's Conservative Party is so far to the right there is no room for progressive-minded individuals or red Conservatives. We do not see that.

The Budget

I am wondering if the member can provide his thoughts as to why the Conservative Party has moved so far to the right, to the detriment of good public policy.

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I obviously reject the characterization by the member opposite. I would ask the member whether he believes it is logical for parents to have to rely on the state after they have been driven into bankruptcy by the policies of the government and whether it is logical for them to want to be wards of state.

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first off, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his service in the Canadian Armed Forces, as we are coming up on Remembrance Day.

I have a huge concern about the amount of the annual deficit the Liberal government has been running for the last 10 years. It is over \$54 billion or \$55 billion, more money than the federal government transfers to the provinces for health care. It is putting enormous stress on future generations.

Does my hon. colleague share the same concerns?

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I once ran myself into credit card debt very badly. I found myself paying hundreds of dollars in interest every single month, with no benefit. If I had not used my credit card, I would have been able to put that money away in savings.

It is not a good feeling to be simply throwing money out the door or giving it to bankers, especially if they are involved with our money in other countries.

I share my colleague's deep concern over the deficit. We are never going to end the deficit if we do not smarten up and have logical budgets in the future.

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to industrial carbon pricing and the claims of what it does to inflation, how does the hon. member respond to a study by the Bank of Canada that says carbon pricing has contributed a maximum of 0.15% to the rate of inflation?

• (1015)

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to that report. I have not read it. What I can tell the hon. member is that we do not need an economics degree to understand that being taxed at every step along the line of food production is going to add costs.

We can parse those numbers, look at them and mitigate them with other numbers. The fact still remains that when we tax the economy, food prices are going to go up. That just makes sense.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleague's province is experiencing much the same thing as Quebec, in other words, a crisis in health and social services due to growing needs and an aging population. As a matter of fact, British Columbia and Quebec are the two provinces where the population is aging at the highest rate. In addition, health care professionals are being asked to do more with less.

Does my colleague not find it unusual that, in the budget we are discussing today, there is no more money being transferred to the provinces so they can provide the quality services necessary to meet the needs of Canadians?

[*English*]

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree, if we were delivering quality health care.

We did a study not long ago, about 10 years ago, in which we found that Interior Health, which is my region's health authority, had a manager for every six workers on the front lines. The management burden at the top has to come down.

I think we can do more with less. I believe that we owe a responsibility to the provinces—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to get up and make my first budget speech on behalf of Skeena—Bulkley Valley. It is quite the auspicious event because this is everything that the Prime Minister promised not to deliver.

The Prime Minister promised less spending and more fiscal responsibility but reversed that once elected. Budget 2025 has brought Canadian debt up to \$1.35 trillion. That number is pretty hard to visualize for the average Canadian, let alone a new MP. The interest payment on this debt for 2025-26 is \$55.6 billion. That is more than the health transfer agreement. That is more than what the Canadian government collects in GST. For all the younger people watching this, because it is going to be their debt, this budget adds \$10 million to our debt every hour.

I want to talk about specific items in the budget that relate directly to my constituents in Skeena—Bulkley Valley. One is the firearms confiscation program put together by the Liberal government. The overall budget for this program is \$742 million, and the budget actually earmarks \$38.7 million for the pilot project in Cape Breton. The Liberal minister responsible for this program said that it will not work, that it is a political stunt and that he would bail his tenant out of jail if these provisions actually affected the tenant renting his property. I think everyone is aware that the Liberal minister responsible for the confiscation program does not even support the program.

I want to talk to Canadians about the penalties. The Liberal government has criminalized law-abiding citizens overnight, the citizens who lawfully and legally registered their guns, got their PALs and obeyed the law. This one piece of legislation turns them into criminals overnight. This includes indigenous people as well, such as indigenous hunters and indigenous sport shooters.

The Budget

If people do not abide by the legislation, they could face up to five years in prison for an indictable offence. For a summary conviction, it is up to two years less a day. This is the penalty for law-abiding citizens. The elbows-up strategy is missing Trump and hitting law-abiding Canadians. This does not make any sense. If we are going to crack down on crime, we should go after criminals. Criminals do not register their guns or get licences.

The amount of money being spent on this program, the \$742 million, could go toward programs for Canadians. It could go toward seniors and youth. It could go toward our economy. It could pay down our debt, God forbid.

It does not make sense for people who inherited firearms, people who purchased firearms or people who are sport shooters to turn their guns in on a voluntary basis and receive \$1,300 per firearm, especially when some of these firearms are a lot more expensive than that.

The cost of groceries is up, and it is going to keep going up. The Prime Minister said he wants to be judged based on prices at grocery stores. The verdict is in: He is guilty of doing nothing. In fact, as prices go up, the usage of food banks increases.

● (1020)

As seniors and middle-income people flock to the food banks, over two million in Canada, 700,000 of which are children, the Liberal government proudly gets up and talks about its contribution to food banks instead of fixing the root cause.

The Liberals have stunted the economy. They have increased taxes, with more on the way. There is a packaging tax. Everybody is talking about how the packaging tax is going to increase costs at the grocery store.

There is another tax coming that the government failed to talk to Canadians about, the International Maritime Organization's carbon tax on shipping. It is not official yet, but it is Canada's intention to vote in favour of this shipping tax that will raise the cost of goods and groceries for Canadians.

I want to talk briefly about the decriminalization experiment that happened when I was an MLA in B.C. It turned B.C. into a haven for drug use; federal dollars were even used to purchase hydromorphone and distribute it unmanaged and unchecked. It started making its way into our general population. This experiment the Liberals used on British Columbians, which Oregon actually got rid of because it did not work, is going to take decades to recover from. This is going to be a generational issue for leaders and legislatures. This experiment was not needed, not when Oregon had already tried it and, when it failed, got rid of it.

Contrary to popular opinion, the emissions cap is not gone. If all the other mechanisms mentioned in the budget fail, the emissions cap will be enforced on the Canadian resource economy. That will limit the Liberal government's plans to turn Canada into an energy superpower and turn us into the best-performing country in the G7.

By the way, if we want to be the best-performing country in the G7, we have to outperform the United States, the largest economy in the G7, if not the world. We are going to have to do 100 times better than what we are doing now. The government is going to

have to get rid of the legislation that limits our economy if we want to be that energy superpower or a well-performing country in the G7. It cannot do it by allowing all these tariffs to take hold in our economy. From the United States alone, the softwood lumber tariff is 45%, reciprocal tariffs are 25% to 35%. There are steel tariffs. The list goes on. India has imposed 30% tariffs on yellow peas. China has 100% tariffs on canola oil, peas, pork, seafood and canola seed. The list goes on. I am not a banker. I did not even graduate high school, but I am pretty sure I could have gotten a better deal than this.

What is the strategy of allowing an ad by the Ontario government to air in the United States to anger it even further and have it stop all negotiations on trade? Can the Liberals please explain to me the strategy behind that?

By the way, after the Prime Minister saw that ad and allowed it to air, B.C. was going to do the same. It later declined, saying it was going to align itself with Canada's strategy on trade. What is the strategy? The strategy so far is putting so much pressure on Canadians that it is stunting our economy.

I have not even talked yet about the Arctic sovereignty that Russia, China and the United States have their eyes on. The government has a sovereignty clause in there, but it does not mention the Northwest Passage, which Russia has aimed its eyes on for shipping goods and drilling for oil and gas.

We are a mess. This budget proves it. That is why I cannot support the budget put forward for 2025.

● (1025)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleague across the way criticizing the budget. However, in this budget, we are making generational investments to strengthen our economy while protecting our social programs.

The Budget

I would like to ask my colleague the following question. If the budget had been tabled by a Conservative government, which social program would my colleague have wanted to eliminate? Would it have been the Canada child benefit, which helps over six million parents across the country? Would it have been the national school food program, which we made permanent and which feeds over 400,000 children? Would he have wanted to cut our affordable child care program, which benefits over 900,000 children? Would he have wanted to put an end to the Canadian dental care plan for which over five million Canadians have registered?

On this side of the House, we have made generational investments while protecting important social programs. Would my colleague who is criticizing the budget have wanted to see some of these programs disappear?

[*English*]

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, this is parallel to what we did in my small native village, which was in worse shape than what Canada is facing right now in terms of the social issues. We would not have cut the social programs. We would have fixed the root causes.

We would not have added to it, as the Liberal government has done. In fact, what the Liberals are saying is, “Hold my beer. We are actually going to double down on what we have already done to the Canadian public.” I cannot support that.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is fairly simple.

The Quebec finance minister has expressed his profound disappointment with the budget, particularly because very little real money will be transferred to the provinces for infrastructure programs. It currently costs between \$4 billion and \$5 billion, or even more, to build a hospital. That is what we saw with CHUM in Quebec.

During this public finance crisis, does my colleague think it is right that Ottawa, which has the money, is not transferring enough to the provinces so that they can invest in their infrastructure?

[*English*]

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I agree.

In fact, if we want to be the best-performing country in the G7, we have to be functioning at all levels. Infrastructure is a key point. We cannot be the best-performing country if we do not take the people along with us, and that includes the economy, social issues and health. I totally agree with the member.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the wisdom he shares all the time. I have known him for a long time. He is a leader within our region, our province and our country. I deeply respect his comments.

My colleague and I have neighbouring ridings, so we face many of the same problems. Just last night I received word of another mill closure in my riding. It is 165 jobs in a small community in my riding, 165 families that are facing uncertainty.

I also want to talk about the mental health and addictions crisis we are facing. There was a 500-page budget tabled just the other day. Mental health and addictions combined were mentioned six times. There is no new money. We now spend more money servicing our debt than on health care transfers to our provinces. That is shameful. I want to ask our hon. colleague for his views on that.

• (1030)

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, coming from a small first nations reserve, I understand mental health and drug addiction, as well as substance abuse issues.

We tried to battle that as much as we could without government support. There was an experiment in B.C. to decriminalize drugs, between Ottawa and B.C. It was a disaster. By the way, as an MLA in the B.C. legislature, I tried to fight as hard as I could to get treatment centres in our region. We were rejected, even though indigenous leaders were the ones putting together the plans.

We have a huge problem across Canada, and it is a shame that the Canadian Liberal government does not recognize this and try to address it head-on.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I may disagree on how we proceed to deal with the mental health and toxic drug crisis, but one thing we can agree on is that the Liberal government has failed to show any leadership.

In the House yesterday, I raised the fact that over 52,000 Canadians have died of toxic overdoses. The response from the Liberal government was that it is a provincial and territorial responsibility. Basically, the Liberals are abandoning any leadership role. There are things we can agree on.

Does my colleague agree with me that the federal government absolutely has a role and responsibility when it comes to the mental health and toxic drug crisis in this country?

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with my colleague. Ottawa does have a role to play.

In fact, if that were not the case, why did it impose this drug experiment in B.C., decriminalizing heroin, cocaine and up to 2.5 grams of fentanyl? We know that 2.5 grams of fentanyl could kill a normal person. Ottawa does have a role to play in the drug crisis we are facing.

Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in the House today to speak about budget 2025, the “Canada Strong” budget. I will be sharing my time with my great colleague, the hon. member for Kanata.

The Budget

On Tuesday, the government presented a plan that makes a generational investment to build the foundation of a stronger, more resilient Canada. It is a plan to build more homes for Canadians, to deliver major infrastructure projects across the country and to support our industries from coast to coast to coast.

Canadians understand that we are living in a rapidly changing and increasingly uncertain world. This budget is our plan of action to navigate those realities.

The government is focused on what it can control: building an economy that is bigger, faster and stronger than ever before.

[Translation]

As Canada's new government, our goal is clear: to make Canada the strongest economy in the G7. We will do that by boosting productivity, competitiveness and innovation, and by creating new opportunities that will benefit all Canadians. For my community of Orleans, this budget includes key investments that will make a real difference in the lives of its residents. As one of the fastest-growing ridings in the National Capital Region, Orleans needs strong local infrastructure and services to keep pace with its growth and improve quality of life.

[English]

Through the building community strong fund, the government is committing \$51 billion over 10 years, starting in 2026-27, to support infrastructure projects in communities across the country.

I have to say that in our budget there was a mention of Orléans. For over over four decades, the Bob MacQuarrie Recreation Complex has been a pillar of our community, a place where residents of all ages come together to stay active, learn new skills and connect. As a former figure skater, I have had the pleasure of using the ice rink at that arena.

I am very thrilled to share that, as highlighted in the budget, Bob MacQuarrie Recreation Complex is one of the 23 highlighted projects that will receive funding through the direct delivery stream to modernize and expand this vital facility. This investment is a testament to the government's commitment to building a stronger Canada. I could not be more excited to help build a stronger Orléans.

● (1035)

[Translation]

As we face a more uncertain global environment, Canada must also be prepared to defend its territory, its people and its sovereignty. That is why this budget includes historic investments in defence. By committing \$81.8 billion over the next five years, we are demonstrating to our allies and our men and women in uniform that Canada takes its national and collective security seriously.

[English]

These investments will strengthen recruitment and retention, deliver well-deserved pay raises and expand access to health care for serving members. They will also repair and sustain existing capabilities while investing new and modern infrastructure, including advanced technologies to protect Canada's digital networks.

I am especially proud that the government is investing in next-generation military capabilities from armoured vehicles and counter-drone systems to long-range precision strike capabilities and submarines. We have come a long way since 2013 when defence spending was below 1% of our GDP. The government has committed to reach 5% by 2035, a clear statement of Canada's commitment to global security and national readiness.

[Translation]

I also want to speak directly to young Canadians, including the youth of Orleans. This budget charts a path to a more affordable and brighter future.

The Canada summer jobs program has been a huge success in Orleans. It has helped young people gain valuable work experience while supporting local employers. This budget proposes additional funding for youth employment of \$1.5 billion over three years through the Canada summer jobs program, the youth employment and skills strategy and the student work placement program. Together, these initiatives will create approximately 175,000 new opportunities for young Canadians and, I hope, for young people in Orleans.

[English]

We are also helping young Canadians achieve the dream of home ownership by eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on homes valued at \$1 million or less through our first-time homebuyers GST tax credit. Through building Canada homes, we will double the pace of home construction over the next decade, building the affordable homes Canadians need.

[Translation]

I am really excited about this budget and the bold path it charts for our country. Under the Prime Minister's leadership, Canada's new government is positioning the country as a global leader by making smart investments, by launching ambitious construction projects and by planning responsibly for the future. This budget delivers for Canadians today and builds a stronger, more prosperous Canada for tomorrow.

[English]

I invite all members of the House to take a close look at what this budget offers, because it is, without a doubt, the right plan for Canada today.

Finally, as we mark Veterans' Week, I want to take a moment to thank the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Veterans Affairs Canada for hosting a beautiful candlelight tribute at the Canadian War Museum to reflect on the service of all the men and women who have served in the defence of Canada. Furthermore, I want to congratulate the Royal Canadian Mint for the beautiful coin it unveiled at the event, which pays tribute to the Unknown Soldier, a beautiful dedication of remembrance. It was truly touching.

The Budget

As Remembrance Day draws near, we pause to honour the brave Canadians who answered the call to service to defend our freedom, our democracy and our way of life.

• (1040)

[*Translation*]

We remember those who gave their lives so that we could live in peace. We thank them for their service and sacrifice. Lest we forget.

[*English*]

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the Globe and Mail's Bill Curry, the government tucked 75 legislative changes into an annex that mysteriously vanished from the printed budget MPs were given. Is this what digital transformation means now, that the Liberals transform transparency into an upload?

Can the member opposite ask the finance minister to table the full online annex today, or are MPs supposed to legislate by hyperlink? Can she explain why the Liberals decided to undertake such deception against fellow parliamentarians?

[*Translation*]

Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, of all the questions my colleague could have asked, I am glad he chose that one. With all due respect to him, what I will say to Canadians and to the people of Orleans that I represent is that our government is there for them. Our government will protect the necessary investments that are important to them while allowing for responsible budgetary expenditures. We are in an era of modernization, with artificial intelligence and everything that goes with it. Again, I say to our young people that we are there for them.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful and proud of my colleague's speech. I heard her talk about the Canada summer jobs program. I believe that very few members of the House recognize that the proposed budget would increase the number of jobs under the Canada summer jobs program from 70,000 to 100,000 next summer.

Could my colleague talk about the impact of this increase in the number of jobs for young people, for community organizations and for small and medium-sized businesses in her riding?

Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, because I think 343 members have been able to take advantage of this program over the past few years. I know it has been useful to me in Orléans. I have always been well aware of the significant benefits of this program, which is making a difference.

We have been asking for this program to be enhanced for several years now, and that is what this government is going to do. Not only will more young people be able to take advantage of it, but more non-profit organizations and small and medium-sized businesses in my community will benefit from having young people there to help them next summer.

[*English*]

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to my hon. colleague across the way, 500 pages were tabled just the other day. Over 50,000 Canadians have died from overdose since 2016. More Canadians have died from overdose than died in World War II, yet there is no new money for addictions in this budget.

Mental health was only mentioned five times. We are now spending more money servicing our debt than we do in health care transfers to provinces.

How does the member rationalize this generational crisis with absolutely no new money?

Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I know how much of an advocate this member has been on the subject of mental health, and I want to commend him for his advocacy. As a former social worker who has first-hand experience on the impacts on mental health, I have to say it is most important that we continue. I was actually quite pleased to see, in the past few years, our federal government, while doing its accord on health care, increase the capacity of transfers specifically on mental health services to local communities.

• (1045)

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canada summer jobs program definitely needed to be indexed. We have been getting many requests for years now to promote student employment and give them a great experience. It is true that it is very appealing, but quite honestly, if I had had a choice, I would have pushed for an increase in health transfers because this is what the provinces are really crying out for.

Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I am proud to answer this question because we have increased funding over the past few years for transfer payments. I was previously a member of a provincial cabinet. I can assure the member that funding was increased by more than \$200 billion, which the provinces have been able to benefit from in recent years. We will continue to be there for the health of Canadians.

[*English*]

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and to the Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 is about meeting the moment and building Canada strong. It is a plan rooted in confidence: confidence in our people, in our innovators and in Canada's ability to lead through change. At a time when the world is shifting, with new trade barriers, global uncertainty and the race to harness technologies such as artificial intelligence, Canada is acting with purpose.

The Budget

This budget invests to protect our sovereignty, supercharge our productivity and empower Canadians to get ahead. It is about spending less to invest more in housing Canadians can afford, in building the infrastructure of the next generation, in clean energy and in creating the high-value jobs of tomorrow.

For the communities I represent, Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, this means accelerating innovation in semiconductors, photonics and AI, and supporting our skilled trades and small businesses, ensuring that the opportunities of the economy are built right here at home.

At the heart of the budget are families and the youth of my community. With budget 2025, we are cutting taxes for the middle class, saving the average two-income family about \$840 a year. We have cancelled the consumer carbon price, lowering gas prices by about 18¢ a litre. We are making the national school food program permanent, helping 400,000 kids get a healthy meal at school and saving families up to \$800 a year. We are continuing to invest in child care, saving families in my community over \$10,000 a year per child.

We are also launching automatic federal benefits so up to 5.5 million low-income Canadians will get the supports they deserve without extra paperwork. For young people, the budget is a game-changer. We are creating 175,000 job placements to help young Canadians gain the skills and experience they need to succeed in high-growth industries of tomorrow, such as technology, clean energy and digital innovation.

These opportunities will ensure that the next generation of Canadians has the tools it needs to help shape the future. For the communities I represent in Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, that means more opportunities for young people and more money staying in families' pockets. Whether it is fuelling the car for hockey practice, paying the mortgage or putting healthy meals on the table, the budget makes life more affordable, more predictable and more fair for Canadian families.

Budget 2025 is about building Canada's future economy, one powered by innovation, research and the incredible talent we have in Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville. The budget invests to supercharge productivity and innovation, introducing the new productivity superdeduction to help companies invest in new technologies and to strengthen the SR&ED tax incentive that fuels R and D.

The budget also makes major commitments in artificial intelligence, semiconductors and photonics, including supporting the Canadian Photonics Fabrication Centre right here in Ottawa, ensuring that we have sovereign semiconductor fabrication capability, world-class research, and manufacturing that stays in Canada.

These investments mean more high-paying jobs, stronger small businesses and new opportunities for our talented engineers, scientists and entrepreneurs. In Kanata North, Canada's largest technology park, the budget builds on our strengths, helping local innovators compete globally while creating the careers of tomorrow right here at home.

Strong communities are the foundation of a strong Canada, and budget 2025 delivers with the new build community strong fund. This landmark \$51-billion investment over 10 years would help

municipalities build the infrastructure that Canadians rely on every day.

• (1050)

For Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, this means upgrades to local roads and transit connections, expanded recreation and community facilities, and stronger flood and stormwater protection for our growing community. This is about giving local leaders the tools to shape their future, building healthy, connected and resilient communities where families can thrive and where every investment helps make our community and our country Canada strong.

Affordable housing is one of the greatest challenges we face, and budget 2025 takes bold action to address it. Through Build Canada Homes, we are launching the most ambitious housing plan in a generation by investing \$25 billion to double the pace of construction, cut red tape and attract private investment. We are also eliminating the GST on new homes under \$1 million for first-time homebuyers and training the next generation of Canadian builders through expanded programs for the skilled trades.

In Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, these measures mean more attainable homes for young families, more work for local builders and tradespeople, and more vibrant, complete communities. Whether it is for a first home, a rental or a place to age, this budget is about restoring the Canadian dream of a house that is affordable, available and built right here at home.

Budget 2025 delivers a generational investment in Canada's security, and that means generational opportunities for Ottawa's defence and technology industries. With a historic \$30-billion investment over five years to rebuild, rearm and reinvest in the Canadian Armed Forces, our budget would ensure that Canada meets NATO's 2% target this year, five years ahead of schedule, while strengthening our domestic defence industrial base.

We are creating a new defence investment agency and launching the defence industrial strategy that puts Canadian companies first. That means growing local supply chains, expanding production capacity and supporting made-in-Canada innovations, from advanced sensors to cybersecurity, AI-enabled systems and secure communications.

For my communities of Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, where defence innovation is part of our DNA, this will mean new contracts, new jobs and new partnerships for companies developing the technologies to keep Canadians safe. From the engineers designing next-generation command systems to the skilled trades supporting our bases and equipment, Ottawa is ready to lead. It is not just an investment in defence; it is also an investment in our people, our technology and our place in the world.

Budget 2025 is about leading with confidence and with discipline. It is a plan that balances ambition with responsibility, because Canadians expect their government to be a careful steward of their hard-earned tax dollars. This budget introduces a new approach: spending less to invest more. We are slowing the growth of government operations, cutting red tape and focusing every dollar on priorities that grow our economy, such as housing, innovation and clean energy.

We are maintaining Canada's lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We are also introducing a capital budgeting framework to clearly separate day-to-day spending from long-term investments that build our country's strengths.

Budget 2025 is more than a fiscal plan; it is a nation-building blueprint for a stronger, more confident Canada. It is about protecting what we value, building where we need and empowering every Canadian to help shape our future.

In Kanata, Carp, Bells Corners and Stittsville, we see what that future looks like: innovators pushing the boundaries of technology, families working hard to build a life, and communities coming together to create opportunity. This budget invests in them: in affordable homes, good jobs, clean energy and the next generation of Canadian ingenuity.

• (1055)

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the red lights go off when I hear about all the investments the Liberals are going to make into tech companies and other businesses, especially when there were so many conflicts of interest with all the tech companies like those in the green slush fund that Liberal insiders and friends were getting their money into. This included COVID contracts' being given to former Liberal ministers.

How many contracts, are we going to find out, are really getting friends and families of Liberals rich?

Hon. Jenna Sudds: Mr. Speaker, I consider myself quite lucky in the role I am in and in being able to represent over 700 companies in Canada's largest technology park.

Budget 2025 puts forward major opportunities for businesses across this country. Whether that is the productivity superdeduction, enabling companies to write off their investments and increase their productivity in the short term; investments in AI and the AI compute fund, creating sovereign digital cloud across this country; or enhancements to the SR&ED credit, these are tangible ways that our government is moving forward to make this country more competitive and increase productivity within our companies.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing missing in this budget that we would have liked to see. It is the renewal of the fisheries fund.

I come from Gaspésie. In the Gaspé Peninsula and the Magdalen Islands, the fisheries fund has historically made it possible to invest \$40 million to spur innovation and promote scientific research. The fund's goal was to ensure that the fisheries sector remained up to date on the issue of new technological advances.

This time, the fisheries fund was not included in the budget. It was not renewed. Can my colleague explain why that is?

[English]

Hon. Jenna Sudds: Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to hear the connection made between fisheries and technology, because we know that by enabling and leveraging technologies, we are able to increase productivity. That extends across so many sectors across our country.

A case in point is the productivity superdeduction, an opportunity for companies and fishers to invest in their businesses and get the equipment they need to be able to be more productive. This is a tangible way that our government is demonstrating our commitment to them and their future.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

BUILD COMMUNITIES STRONG FUND

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our new budget is about empowering Canadians and strengthening our economic future. It invests in our resilience, our competitiveness and our confidence in the future, not just through big, national projects, but through meaningful investments in smaller communities, where local projects have a tremendous impact on people's daily lives. This is why I am so proud of the build communities strong fund, which would ensure that communities of every size receive the support they need to grow and prosper.

I am thrilled that the White Rock Pier is one of the projects supported in this budget. The pier is more than a landmark; it is the focal point of my community, a gathering place and the main driver for tourism. I have been advocating for its restoration since the day I began campaigning.

Statements by Members

Central to the budget 2025 plan is building major infrastructure, more homes and stronger communities, one community at a time.

* * *

DARSHAN SINGH SAHSI

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, too frequently now, I rise in this chamber to speak to shootings in my community because of the rapid rise of gun crime.

Last week, Darshan Singh Sahsi was fatally shot and killed in Abbotsford. He was a father, a philanthropist and a man who came from humble beginnings. I knew Mr. Sahsi personally, and I am struck by the reality that I will never see him again. I trust that the Abbotsford Police Department is doing everything in its power to bring justice to the Sahsi family.

To his children and loved ones, I express my deepest condolences. I am so sorry for their loss. As a friend and a member of Parliament, I am here for them.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the proposed improvements to the Newton Athletic Park in the heart of Surrey Newton. Thanks to budget 2025, federal funding will support a new artificial turf field, a practice field, tennis courts and lighting for the walking paths. By creating a more welcoming environment, this project will promote active living, foster community well-being and maximize the park's use throughout the year.

Investments like this, along with upgrades to the Royal Athletic Park in Victoria and the White Rock Pier my colleague already talked about, and support for a new Filipino community and cultural centre in metro Vancouver strengthen community bonds and promote wellness.

I will continue to advocate for Surrey Newton and its residents to ensure our community remains safe, vibrant and thriving for everyone.

* * *

ADDICTION SERVICES

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, families grieve, addicts struggle and communities do their best to backfill for government failure, and the Liberal government's transformational budget has nothing for us. The word "addiction" appears only once, on page 247, to remind us that \$1.2 billion in provincial transfers to support not only addictions, but home and community care and mental health services will vanish after the 2026-27 fiscal year.

Today, I am standing up and saying what the 20 Liberal MPs from British Columbia do not have the guts to say, even though Pandora Avenue and the Downtown Eastside are both in Liberal ridings. With this budget, the Liberal government has abandoned us. There is no national strategy, no support for local treatment and recovery and no recognition of the crisis that is unfolding in towns and cities like mine.

In Nanaimo, we need funding for local treatment and recovery beds. Our frontline workers need support, and our communities need a real path to healing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FRANCOPHONE IMMIGRATION

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ensuring the vitality of francophone minority communities remains a priority for our government, and francophone immigration is an essential part of achieving this goal.

As we celebrate National Francophone Immigration Week, it is important to remember the progress that has been made and the next steps to be taken. Thanks to the 2026-28 immigration levels plan announced in the 2025 budget, we are aiming for a steady increase in francophone admissions outside Quebec: 9% in 2026, 9.5% in 2027, and 10.5% in 2028. Since 2022, we have consistently exceeded our admission targets and are on track to reach a new historic high of 8.5%. I would also like to highlight the francophone community immigration pilot, which helps skilled workers settle in rural francophone regions.

As Canada stabilizes its immigration levels, our government is choosing to protect and strengthen francophone immigration.

* * *

● (1105)

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court ruling yesterday removed the last chance these decades-old ostriches had, and I sympathize with the tens of thousands of Canadians who have been caught up in the drama unfolding on a farm in Edgewood, B.C.

For the past 10 months, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency operation has disrupted life in the peaceful town of Edgewood, B.C., driven the farm deep into debt and cost Canadian taxpayers millions of dollars in police overtime and agency costs. Perhaps most chilling has been the silence of both the Liberal Minister of Health and the Liberal Minister of Agriculture. They allowed this to drag out for far too long, keeping Canadians in the dark and even laughing at the plight of these people.

Statements by Members

This is not how the government should treat our citizens. We still live in a democracy, despite the Liberals' best efforts, and Canadians deserve to know what our government is up to and why.

* * *

CHESTER W. RUTTLE

Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over 1.1 million Canadians served in the war effort during World War II. More than 45,000 of those brave men and women made the ultimate sacrifice, and another 55,000 were wounded. Among them was Chester W. Ruttle.

Chester proudly served in the merchant marine. His work, and that of his fellow service members, was perilous. No one was immune from the threat below the waterline, and Chester was no exception. Both vessels he served on were torpedoed, and both times, he found himself at the mercy of the frigid waters. He was pulled to safety, but not before he suffered nerve damage and lost partial circulation in his legs.

If his service had any silver lining, it came in the form of a nurse who cared for him named Marion. They fell in love, married and had five children, including my father-in-law, Darrell Ruttle, and seven grandchildren, including my wife Paula Ruttle.

On behalf of the Ruttle family and all grateful Canadians, I am honoured to thank Chester for his service and his sacrifice. He was indeed part of the greatest generation.

* * *

BONE MARROW DONORS

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every year, so many Canadians and their families face the unimaginable challenge of searching for a life-saving bone marrow match.

Becoming a bone marrow donor is one of the most selfless and meaningful acts a person can do. It does not require wealth or status, just a willingness to help a person in need, like my nephew, Lincoln, who received a bone marrow transplant from his generous donor, Ann, and like Ollie Ferguson, who is with us here in Ottawa today.

Ollie was in need of a bone marrow donor and found one in his sister Scarlett. Because of Scarlett, Ollie has been able to chase his passion for driving race cars. He races pro late model cars, and he is only 15. Because of Scarlett, he can enjoy climbing the ranks of racing.

I encourage everyone to join Canadian Blood Services' stem cell registry. Sign up online and get a cheek swab. It is a simple act that could easily save someone's life.

I thank those who have already registered as a donor. Together, we can continue to show the compassion and generosity that makes Canada so great.

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL ECONOMY MONTH

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, in this month of November, that we call attention to this year's Social Economy Month, because it builds on the advocacy and promotion surrounding the 2025 Social Economy Summit. The summit was so historic that the advocacy work and resulting call to action were unanimously supported by the Quebec National Assembly.

The turnout included 1,500 people from all regions and all sectors, including the economic, cultural, community, union and political sectors. Their common goal was to highlight the transformative potential of the social economy for responding to Quebec's collective challenges, such as population aging, the housing shortage, the protection of our natural environment and cultural vitality.

This being Social Economy Month, it seems fitting and necessary that the Bloc Québécois support the next steps in this effort and continue building an economy that works for us.

* * *

● (1110)

[*English*]

CRAFT BREWERS

Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate Port Coquitlam's Patina Brewing on its success at the 2025 BC Beer Awards. On October 17, at New Westminister's Anvil Centre, Patina earned second place in the mixed-style beer category for its Italian Pilsner. This recognition reflects the skill and pride of a hometown team that keeps raising the bar for quality and community.

Our region's craft beer scene is thriving. Local brewers brought home six awards this year, with strong showings from Burnaby's Dageraad Brewing, Port Moody's Yellow Dog Brewing and New Westminister's Steel & Oak Brewing Co.

These achievements come during challenging times for the industry and they speak to resilience, creativity and the support of loyal customers across the Tri-Cities and New Westminister.

Congratulations, Patina. Keep brewing excellence.

*Statements by Members***THE BUDGET**

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal waste, Canadians hoped for change. Instead, the Prime Minister delivered the costliest budget outside of COVID with a bloated, inflation-fuelling deficit that punishes work, drives up prices and shatters every promise his government made. He vowed discipline, but his budget explodes the deficit to \$80 billion, piles on \$90 billion in new spending and drives both debt and inflation higher.

While the Liberals borrow and spend, investment collapses, unemployment climbs and the cost of living crushes working families. Canadians pay more in interest on Liberal debt than Ottawa transfers for health care. Every dollar does not go to doctors or nurses but rather bankers and bondholders. Ordinary Canadians are paying the price in higher bills, higher taxes and vanishing hope for their kids. Canadians have sacrificed enough. They cannot afford another inflationary Liberal budget.

Conservatives will fight for the people who work, pay their bills and build this country, and we will keep working to restore the affordable life Canadians deserve.

* * *

MOVEMBER

Jake Sawatzky (New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November is Movember, a month for men's health awareness. We lose far too many men to suicide every year.

I urge the boys and men hearing this today to take care of their health. It is easy to feel alone, but there are many people who care about them very much and they can talk to. Their existence as people is valuable. If they are ever considering self-harm, I ask them to please fight back against that voice in their head. It is okay to reach out for help. That is the brave thing to do. They just need to talk about it. It is brave to be open about these things.

I encourage everyone to take part in Movember, whether that is by growing a moustache, fundraising, exercising or organizing men's health events. This is a very important cause.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the long-awaited federal budget was tabled, and while a new Liberal leader was supposed to mean a new direction, this budget proves it is the same government with the same wasteful spending and the same pain for Canadians.

Families are cutting back on groceries, young people cannot afford homes and retirees are watching their savings shrink. Under the new Liberal leader, nothing has changed. Actually, that is not true. Things are getting worse.

Yesterday, Statistics Canada confirmed that food inflation is rising again. Canada is the only G7 country to see four straight months of rising food inflation. Between March and September, food inflation jumped sharply across everyday staples. Coffee and tea prices rose 15% and beef and berries are up 25%. These are not luxury goods; they are essentials.

Conservatives put forward a plan to lower food prices by cutting the industrial carbon tax, the food packaging tax and the costly fuel standard, and by ending inflationary deficits, but the Liberals voted it down. Canadians deserve better. Conservatives will fight for an affordable budget for an affordable life for all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

VETERANS' WEEK

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Veterans' Week, I would like to pay tribute to all those who have served Canada with courage and dedication in times of war, conflict and peace.

Members of the Canadian Armed Forces have protected our country, defended our values and contributed to international peace and security. Their service reflects Canada's commitment to freedom, democracy and solidarity among nations. On November 8, we pay tribute to indigenous veterans who served with bravery and loyalty. By fully recognizing their contributions, we honour their legacy and affirm our commitment to remembrance and reconciliation.

On November 11, we mark Remembrance Day to honour the memory of those who gave their lives so that we could live in peace. Their courage and sacrifice remain a source of inspiration for all Canadians. Let us all proudly wear our poppies during this week of remembrance. Lest we forget.

* * *

● (1115)

[English]

THE BUDGET

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Liberal government released its 10th budget, with the costliest deficit outside of COVID and double what the Prime Minister's predecessor left behind. Mark Carney broke every promise he made. He promised he would keep the deficit at \$62 billion—

The Speaker: We cannot refer to members of this House by their proper name.

The member for London—Fanshawe.

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister broke every promise he made. He promised to keep the deficit at \$62 billion, a level the Parliamentary Budget Officer had already called “unsustainable”, yet it will now balloon to nearly \$80 billion. He said he would lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but both debt and inflation are rising. He promised to spend less, but added \$90 billion more. That is \$5,400 in extra inflationary spending per household.

Families in London are paying the price. Groceries, gas, rent and mortgages keep climbing while paycheques fall further behind. Canadians already spend more on debt interest than on health care. The budget at this time is simply irresponsible.

Conservatives stand for an affordable budget for an affordable life. Londoners deserve hope, homes and a future they can afford.

* * *

SLEEP IN HEAVENLY PEACE

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Moncton—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all children deserve a safe, comfortable place to lay their heads, but for some families, a bed for each child is a luxury they simply cannot afford.

Since 2018, Sleep in Heavenly Peace Canada has put out a motion for change, as volunteers donate material and their time to help build beds and distribute them in communities across the country. Our local Moncton chapter was founded just this past June and has already built and delivered 52 beds. Nationwide, the objective is to deliver 3,000 beds by the end of this year.

My husband, Brock, and I recently accepted an invitation to join local leaders at Sleep in Heavenly Peace, Jim Merzetti and Marie-Claire Pierce, and helped build some beds with a group of local volunteers.

I thank Jim and Marie-Claire for their invitation and for their tireless devotion to this cause. I encourage all Canadians to look for their nearest chapter of Sleep in Heavenly Peace or even to start a chapter in their area to support this wonderful charity.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. The more it spends, the more things cost. Its so-called generational budget is nothing more than generational debt, mortgaging away our children’s future. Massive Liberal deficits feed inflation. Inflation fuels unaffordability.

Our seniors can barely buy groceries, our families are stretched thin, and our workers are falling behind, yet the Prime Minister still wants them to make more sacrifices. Can the Prime Minister tell us what more is left for Canadians to sacrifice?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this morning brings the outstanding news of tens of thousands,

in fact, 69,000, new jobs in Canada, in the second straight month of employment growth in this country.

What is happening, as the Minister of Natural Resources informed us yesterday, is that investors are piling into Canada. They are expressing confidence in our country. The entrepreneurs, the tech sector and young people are getting energized about this positive economic momentum.

We are going to keep it going with this budget. I hope the Conservatives support us in it.

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Brookfield budget has the largest deficit in history outside of COVID. The interest payments are topping \$55 billion, more than what we spend on health care transfers. This means less for doctors, less for nurses and less for our hospitals, but more for bondholders and Liberal insiders. The only thing that is getting healthy under the government is the bankers’ profits. They keep getting rich while Canadians foot the price.

Can the Prime Minister tell us why he is so hell-bent on making sure his banker buddies get rich while Canadians suffer?

• (1120)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think, as it is Friday, it is worth repeating. The economy has added 67,000 new jobs. Even the Conservatives are happy this morning, on a Friday. We can look at their faces. They are smiling because they are going back home and they have good news, and not only on the budget. There are hundreds of pages of good news. Also, this morning they can say that the plan of the government will build Canada strong, because of what? Because we believe in Canada.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, only a bunch of Liberals would stand up and applaud an unemployment rate of 7% when the United States’ unemployment rate is 4.2%.

This is the most expensive government in Canadian history. In 10 years, the Liberals doubled the debt, and now they are going to pile on another \$78 billion. Meanwhile, 2.2 million Canadians are going to the food bank. The softwood lumber industry is being devastated. The auto industry is being devastated.

Is there a Liberal over there who can stand up and explain how the government has spent so much money to accomplish so little?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 67,000 is how many new jobs were created last month. Twenty thousand of these jobs were for young Canadians, a clear sign that our plan is working.

In Canada, one in five jobs is related to trade. From small businesses to major exporters, Canadians are driving growth and creating opportunities.

Oral Questions

In budget 2025, we have a plan to support our entrepreneurs, our workers and our exporters as we build the strongest economy in the G7.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, how do the Liberals stand up and applaud an unemployment rate of 7% when the United States' unemployment rate is 4.2%? It is actually like we are living in some kind of dystopian universe where they do this.

The facts are these. Our softwood lumber industry is being hollowed out, 2.2 million Canadians are using the food bank, the auto industry is on its knees, and the Liberals stand and applaud a 7.1% unemployment rate.

They have spent more money than all governments combined in the history of Canada. How can they applaud when they have spent so much to actually accomplish so little?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is something to applaud about. We created 67,000 new jobs last month. That is right. This is about building an affordable nation for a nation of builders. This budget does just that.

We are building affordable housing for young people. We are creating 100,000 new summer jobs. We are investing in the tech sector. At 800,000 workers, it is the fastest-growing job sector in the economy, with many for young people.

I hope the Conservatives, and many of them do, support this budget.

* * *

[Translation]

FINANCE

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have tabled the costliest budget with the biggest deficit in Canadian history, excluding the pandemic. The deficit is nearly \$80 billion. A deficit is what happens when we live beyond our means. A deficit is a bill that we send to our children and our grandchildren. A deficit pours fuel on the fire of inflation.

Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise by recklessly spending more and pouring fuel on the inflationary fire?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to inform my colleague that the Canadian economy added 67,000 jobs in the past month, and that is just the start. If the Conservatives help us pass budget 2025, we will unleash the power of the Canadian economy by building major projects such as the one in Contrecoeur or the container project at the port of Quebec, which my colleague's leader was praising yesterday in Quebec City.

I hope the Conservatives will support the budget to build the strongest economy in the G7.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I am not at all proud of the figure that I am about to share: 2.2 million Canadians are visiting food banks

every month. That is the Liberal track record after 10 years. Of these 2.2 million Canadians, one in three is a child. That means that 700,000 children in Canada are relying on food banks to eat. I am sorry, but I love Canada too much to watch this happen.

Why is the government continuing to rack up chronic deficits?

The deficit is \$80 billion, and we know that a deficit is a debt that we pass on to our children and grandchildren. Canadians deserve better than that.

● (1125)

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget is a budget that invests in our children. It takes money to invest so that we can create jobs and give all Canadians back their purchasing power. That is what matters. That is what we are doing. That is what Canadians are hoping for, and I hope that our colleagues will support this budget that will give power back to all Canadians.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there would never have been a confidence vote on the budget today if the Liberals had worked in Quebec's best interests, but, unfortunately, here we are. We are here because they refused to negotiate in good faith despite their minority status. They rejected Quebec's demands on health care and infrastructure, just as they ignored the needs of seniors facing the cost of living crisis and the needs of young people hoping to become homeowners.

Why did they orchestrate this confidence vote instead of just responding to the needs of Quebecers?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are fully confident that Quebecers have seen the investments this budget is making in culture. They have confidence in that. They have confidence in our investments in housing. They have confidence in our investments in the military sector to create jobs at Davie and in aerospace. They have confidence that the Liberal Party will protect our language, culture and Radio-Canada across Canada and invest in our language, our culture in Quebec and our unique Quebec identity.

Quebeckers have expressed confidence in this budget. The only question that remains is whether the Bloc Québécois will do the same.

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers did not vote Conservative, but this is a Conservative budget, despite its Liberal deficits. Health care cuts, mass layoffs and climate capitulation are all Conservative ideas. The government House leader actually confirmed that in the House on Wednesday when he said that this is a budget that even Conservative voters can like. It must be working, since the Conservative ranks are in turmoil. They can identify with this budget.

Why did the Liberals decide to pander to the Conservatives instead of listening to Quebecers' demands?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very proud to have 44 members from Quebec on this side of the House, which is the largest contingent of members from Quebec ever in this place. We are there to support Quebecers.

Quebeckers asked us for money for health care. We delivered, with hospitals, emergency rooms and medical clinics. We also received support from Quebecers for our French language and culture initiatives. We have made investments. In the end, what Quebecers want is jobs, and this is a budget that is going to create jobs.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals used to draft budgets to please the NDP. Now they are drafting budgets to please the Conservatives. However, there are never any budgets to meet the needs of Quebecers. What Quebecers want is a health care system that works. They want to be able to age without losing their purchasing power. They want affordable housing. They want young people to be able to buy a home like the generations before them. That is what we are dealing with in Quebec.

Why are the Liberals threatening an election instead of meeting the needs of Quebecers?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleague to actually read the budget.

He mentioned housing. There is a massive investment to build housing in Quebec. He mentioned health care. Quebecers want high-quality health care infrastructure. There is money for that in the budget. Quebecers want good jobs. Major projects are planned across Quebec to develop our resources and create opportunities for young people. My colleague mentioned purchasing power. There is a tax cut for 22 million Canadians that will save families an average of \$800.

What do Quebecers want? They want a budget that is responsible and ambitious, and that is exactly what we are delivering.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister proposed the worst budget deficit in history outside of the COVID period. Every dollar he spends costs Canadians in taxes and through inflation. More spending by government means more sacrifices for Canadians, with more than one in four Canadians now living in financially insecure households.

Will the Prime Minister at least consider reducing his deficits to levels we saw under Justin Trudeau?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is remarkable about this budget is that it builds for the future but helps people today. This is a budget that

cuts taxes for 22 million Canadians, saving families up to \$800 a year. It makes the national school food program permanent, helping over half a million kids. It delivers automatic federal tax filing for five and a half million Canadians. It invests in housing, it invests in infrastructure and it lowers barriers to make the Canada disability benefit more accessible.

If the member opposite truly cares about affordability for families in Canada, he will come on over and vote for this budget.

• (1130)

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know it is difficult for some members of the Liberal caucus to understand, but parents would actually prefer to be able to afford to buy food themselves for their kids. They used to be able to before the Liberals took office.

The latest numbers today show that more than one in four people in Canada is living in a financially insecure household. That is the legacy of that party.

It was not this way before; it does not have to be this way again. When will the Liberals change course?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives think they know best, but they are actually ignoring the experts. They are ignoring the Coalition for Healthy School Food, which calls this budget a “great step forward to support children and youth in Canada.” They are ignoring the Heart and Stroke Foundation and the Breakfast Club of Canada, which also applaud our commitment to making the national school food program permanent.

The Conservatives need to listen to the experts, listen to Children First Canada, about why this program makes a difference and why half a million families across the country would benefit from it.

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, speaking of experts, according to Fitch Ratings just yesterday, “Canada’s...proposed budget, announced in Parliament on Nov. 4, underscores the erosion of the federal government’s finances...[and] persistent fiscal expansion and a rising debt burden have weakened its credit profile and could increase rating pressure over the medium term.”

This has happened before, with crushing impacts on Canadians. In the nineties, after similar rating pressure, the Liberal government of the day was forced to cut 32% from federal health and social transfers over just two years.

Does anyone over there understand the gravity of this situation?

Oral Questions

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as somebody who has spent much of his life in the banking community, I will tell the member about the S&P and Moody's ratings, which are AAA, the best in the entire world. We have the second-lowest debt-to-GDP ratio. We are doing just fine.

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, ratings are always great until the day they are not. Here is a quick review of the early nineties from Reuters.

In February 1994, it said, "The...Liberal government brings down what it considers to be a tough budget.... It nonetheless still has spending rising slightly, and immediate public and market reaction is it did not go nearly far enough."

In January 1995, it said, "A biting editorial in the Wall Street Journal headlined 'Bankrupt Canada' calls Canada 'an honorary member of the Third World.'" The next month, the Liberal government was forced to make the most vicious cuts to health care and social programs in Canadian history.

Who over there is willing to take a stand to avoid a repeat?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 includes generational investments to rebuild, rearm and reinvest in the Canadian Armed Forces, and it starts with our people.

This budget includes a \$2-billion historic pay and benefits package, which will impact close to 100,000 forces members and their families. Untrained sailors, privates and aviators are receiving a 20% pay raise. That is what is in our budget. That is what is at stake.

All members of the House should come together to support our forces, as they help to build and keep Canada strong.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while Canadians are being forced to choose between heating and eating, the government has chosen to increase our national debt by \$80 billion.

Can the Prime Minister please explain how driving up debt and increasing the cost of living are going to help the single mom skipping meals, the senior afraid to open their hydro bill or the young family priced out of their new home? Is this just continued economic theatre from a government that has completely lost touch with reality?

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they say they are fighting for youth, but they plan to vote against the national school food program. They say they are fighting for families, but they plan to vote against the middle-income tax cut. They say they are fighting for workers, but they plan to vote against the \$75-million apprenticeship training fund. They say they are fighting for our borders, but they plan to vote against a much-needed pay raise for service members in our armed forces, including in my riding at CFB Esquimalt.

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

• (1135)

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal inflationary deficits, working Canadians have never had it so tough. People lined up at food banks and parents putting beef back on the grocery store shelf were desperate for something in the budget to bring prices down.

Did the Prime Minister scrap hidden taxes on food? No. Did he scrap the 17¢ fuel standards tax? No. The Prime Minister heard the cries of working Canadians and what did he do? He scrapped the luxury tax on private jets and yachts. That is right. The only measure in this budget to make things cheaper will only apply to boats and airplanes.

Can the Prime Minister tell us how many Canadians lined up at food banks will benefit from the private jet tax cut?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians want is a government that will invest in their futures and invest in their possibilities. That is exactly what we have been doing.

Some 67,000 new jobs were added this month. For two months in a row, we are seeing unemployment go down. What is great about this is that youth unemployment is going down. The investments we are making are working.

This is a budget for young people, seniors and families. The Conservatives are going to vote against things like dental care and child care. That is what families need, and that is exactly what this budget delivers.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if they really wanted to give workers a break, they would scrap the industrial carbon tax that their American competitors do not have to pay.

Now we all know who this budget really was for: It was a Brookfield boardroom budget. After all, the billions in extra debt means that bankers and bondholders get big interest payments, and when those board members go out to buy a luxury private jet, they get a big tax break.

A Gulfstream G600 is currently listed for \$63 million. Can the Prime Minister tell us how much a Brookfield executive will save with the private jet tax cut, and how much more Canadians will have to pay when food prices go up?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Conservatives, Canadians do not live in a pretend world. They know there is no tax on food. They know which party always votes against affordability, dental care, pharmacare, child care and basically anything with the word “care” in it. Most importantly, Canadians know that our government is there for them with a budget that will protect jobs in critical sectors like auto, steel, aluminum and lumber, and that will build affordable housing and the infrastructures our communities need all across Canada, empowering and catalyzing our economy.

If you are really there for Canadians, you will vote for the budget.

The Speaker: I would remind the member to go through the Chair. I cannot vote unless there is a tie.

The hon. member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj.

* * *

[Translation]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Radio-Canada's *Enquête* aired a shocking report on lobster smuggling in New Brunswick. This is troubling for the people of Gaspé and for the Maritimes as a whole.

The problem is all the more serious given that, for the past several weeks, troubling revelations have come to light at the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans about political interference in fisheries officers' efforts to combat illegal fishing. Officials from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are reportedly keeping experienced officers from doing their job.

Why are senior department officials intervening to prevent the law from being enforced?

[English]

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unauthorized fishing is unacceptable, full stop. Fisheries officers have many tools they use in the management of unauthorized fishing, from education to charges to fines. Often, their work happens in remote areas and at times of the day when people are not aware of the work they are doing.

I want to thank fisheries officers for their outstanding work in keeping our fisheries safe and peaceful.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, illegal lobster fishing is putting the species at risk, and that is what concerns fishers the most. They want to protect the resource so that their kids and grandkids get to fish too. We can do something about illegal fishing; all we need to do is enforce the law. All that the fisheries stakeholders who appear before the committee are asking is that officers be allowed to do their work without political interference or reprisals.

Oral Questions

My question is simple, and the answer needs to be clear. Will the government ensure that these fisheries officers are able to enforce the law?

• (1140)

[English]

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleague that the work is happening. He needs to look at what has happened in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and other parts of the country.

Fisheries officers are on the water. We support their work. They are making a difference. We accept nothing but authorized fishing.

* * *

[Translation]

CARBON PRICING

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the most expensive government in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes directly out of the pockets of Canadians. The more he spends, the more it costs.

In my riding's agricultural regions, farmers' costs are skyrocketing because of the industrial carbon tax. Fertilizer, farm equipment and transportation: The cost of everything is going up. It is costing more to farm, and that is driving up grocery prices.

While this Prime Minister is spending money hand over fist, families are struggling to put food on the table. Why is this government refusing to admit that its industrial carbon tax is a tax on food that we all have to pay for?

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, obviously, it is important to maintain the industrial carbon tax to protect our climate and so forth. That said, the cost of living is the number one priority for our constituents, and we are working on that. This is a responsible budget that enables us to do so.

When will the official opposition understand that we need to look at the factors that contribute to Canadians' success? We are counting on the official opposition to support the budget.

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, clearly this parliamentary secretary is out of touch with the reality on the ground, especially in the regions. According to a Nanos poll, one in five Canadians skipped paying a bill just to be able to put food on the table. Frankly, that is unacceptable.

Can the Prime Minister explain to my voters and to Liberal voters why he is insisting on keeping the industrial carbon tax while families have to choose between heating their home and filling their fridge?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that Quebecers support the budget because we have met their expectations with good jobs in my colleague's riding, including in La Pocatière. The people who work at Alstom are going to be able to have good jobs. They will be able to buy groceries and support their families.

Quebeckers also want a good health care system. At the federal level, we ensured that transfers continued to increase in the last budget and we secured them in this budget. We have also provided support to build hospitals. The Government of Quebec asked us to do so and we delivered. We are there for Quebec.

[English]

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to spend less but have introduced the largest budget deficit in history outside of COVID. This is at a time when one in five Canadians say they skipped paying a bill to afford groceries this past year.

The Liberals had a chance to lower food prices. Instead, they increased the industrial carbon tax on our farms, driving up the cost of fertilizer and farm equipment.

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

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should take next week to meet with local chapters of the building trades in her riding.

I encourage every member to take next week to meet with the locals to understand why they are supporting this budget. From coast to coast to coast, workers are supporting our plan: the Canadian building trades, the Alberta building trades, IBEW, carpenters and on and on. They are endorsing the investments made in this budget. The SEIU said it best: "Promise made. Promise kept."

They are supporting the investments because we are building good union jobs. We are building this country.

* * *

FINANCE

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberal government, young Canadians are struggling. They are struggling to afford homes in one of the least affordable housing markets in the world. They are struggling to find jobs in an economy that is increasingly slowing down, and they are struggling just to afford food after some of the highest food inflation in more than 30 years.

The budget was an opportunity to do right by the next generation. Instead, the Liberals announced over \$300 billion in new debt, debt that will be left to these exact same young Canadians to pay for. How is that ethical? How is that fair? How is that remotely fiscally responsible?

• (1145)

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is one number: 67,000 jobs created.

How are we supporting them? We are supporting them by investing in their health. Through budget 2025, we are investing \$5 billion to renew hospitals and health care centres, as well as \$97 million to recognize skilled professionals faster, and giving new supports for personal support workers.

Do not just take it from me, Mr. Speaker; take it from the CMA, which says this is a "[right] step in the right direction" to support the health of our nation.

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question for the Liberal government. Over the past 10 years, it has doubled Canada's national debt. In that same time, unsurprisingly, it has also doubled the amount of taxpayers' money that it has wasted on paying interest on that debt. In fact, today, we now spend \$55 billion a year just on interest payments. That is more than we collect from the GST. That is more than we spend on health care. Now it wants to borrow another \$320 billion.

Does the government really think that spending \$55 billion not on health care, not on roads, but on interest, is a good use of taxpayers' money, yes or no?

Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are building Canada strong, and that includes the spaces and places that Canadians go to play, to practise and to exercise. A healthy lifestyle is preventative medicine, and we are building the facilities necessary right across this country, with new rinks, new pools and new field houses, so the next generation of Canadians can have better physical literacy and a healthier lifestyle, and so they can connect with their communities in those important places.

Why will the Conservatives not join us to build Canada strong and make sure that every community has access to those facilities, the infrastructure that keeps us healthy and our communities connected?

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chris Malette (Bay of Quinte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my riding, the Bay of Quinte, so many of my neighbours are friends of veterans, family members of veterans or veterans themselves. It is a privilege and an honour to be here to represent them. The generational budget introduced by the Prime Minister and finance minister earlier this week will be deeply impactful to communities across Canada, including those like mine that are home to so many veterans and active military members and their families, as well as to all Canadians.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs offer his comments on budget 2025?

Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge Lieutenant Colonel Skip Simpson, retired, from the member for Bay of Quinte's office, both for his service to our country and for his service to the constituents in the Bay of Quinte.

Budget 2025 indeed represents generational investment in communities across Canada. It also includes \$185 million to streamline services for veterans and their families. I call on all members of the House to join me in acknowledging the service and sacrifice of all Canada's veterans and their families.

* * *

ETHICS

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, top executives at the Prime Minister's company, Brookfield, are defying an order of the House to testify at committee about his use of offshore tax havens. This is tantamount to contempt of Parliament.

Will the Prime Minister pick up the phone and tell his pals at Brookfield to comply with the House order, or is he complicit in the cover-up?

Hon. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the news today was that we created 67,000 jobs, six-seven. It is great news. We are growing the economy, and budget 2025 is making historic investments that are going to keep this economy moving for generations to come.

Why do the Conservatives not stand up and support this investment budget?

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, evidently, the Prime Minister is complicit, because here are the facts: He was chair of the company that is Canada's biggest tax-dodger. Not only that, but he set up investment funds in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands in which he stands to make millions. The Prime Minister has a responsibility to come clean and come clean today.

How much cash does he have stashed in offshore tax havens?

● (1150)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a responsibility to help build this country and create jobs, and we created 67,000 jobs in the last month alone. We have a plan in budget 2025 to build this country up by building major projects, including in the member's riding and province. We have investments to help support young people in this country, to build up apprentices, to be able to drive this country forward.

That is what we are focused on over on this side of the House: supporting Canadians, creating good jobs and helping drive this country forward. That is what we are going to keep doing.

Oral Questions

HOUSING

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. The more the government spends, the more things like housing cost.

The Ontario Home Builders' Association says it is deeply disappointed with the Liberal budget, which fails to unlock supply and restore affordability. The government's inaction on housing has put 40,000 jobs at risk in Ontario, and the impact of these losses on the Ontario economy could be \$5.3 billion.

How can the Liberal budget cost so much but deliver so little to Canadians?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Oscar Wilde described a "cynic" as someone who knows the cost of everything but the value of nothing.

On this side of the House, we value investments in health care, we value investments in jobs, we value investments in the Canadian Armed Forces and we value investments in housing. We have irony and hypocrisy on full display when the member stands up to advocate for more money for housing before he votes against a budget that has record investments in housing.

On this side of the House, we are going to listen to Canadians and make investments to improve their quality of life. I wish, for once, the Conservatives could do the same.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Premier Eby says the court decided not to provide Richmond homeowners with notice of the Cowichan court litigation, but the Cowichan lawyers said the judge in the case said the parties were free to provide notice of this litigation to private landowners years ago. This includes Canada as represented by the Attorney General. Canada has been and still is missing in action.

Why is the Prime Minister being so quiet at a time when people are anxious about their homes and looking for answers?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court's ruling and appealed it on September 8. Further legal clarity is required to address the decision, particularly relating to private property rights. The Province of British Columbia, the City of Richmond, Musqueam Indian Band and Tsawwassen First Nation have also appealed.

We will continue to work collaboratively with all parties to uphold the principles of reconciliation, transparency and legal responsibility to all parties. We remain available for dialogue with the other parties to the litigation throughout this process.

Oral Questions

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, there is chaos and panic in B.C. Everybody is complaining, and everybody is blaming each other. The public is blaming Richmond's counsel. Premier Eby is blaming the court. The government continues to stay quiet. This was only the second time I have heard the government say anything about this case. The first time, it was a staffer. It has always been the Crown's duty to deal with rights and title issues. That is clear in the 2004 Haida court case.

Does the Prime Minister have any statements to make to Canadian citizens regarding the Cowichan ruling?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we did make an announcement in September on this, and we remain available to work with all parties to address this matter.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, homeowners in Richmond are sounding the alarm. The Cowichan court ruling undermines the principle of private property ownership, and many fear their homes and businesses are at risk. The Liberal government saw this coming and did nothing. There is no explanation, no reassurance and no leadership, and the government remains silent. Richmond is left in the dark. Families are anxious; investors are pulling back, and confidence in our communities is crumbling.

Why will the Liberal government not stand up to defend property rights in Richmond and soon across Canada?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I just said to the other member, Canada disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court's ruling and appealed it on September 8. We remain available for dialogue with the other parties to the litigation throughout this process.

* * *

● (1155)

HEALTH

Jamil Jivani (Bowmanville—Oshawa North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberals have banned the vast majority of nicotine pouches for sale in Canada, despite the fact that many Canadians use these products to help quit smoking. Canadians just want to go to the corner store, the gas station or wherever cigarettes are sold and choose an alternative product. Even the Neighbourhood Pharmacy Association of Canada agrees.

When will the Liberals do the right thing? When will the Liberals free the Zyn?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government remains firmly committed to reducing smoking rates, especially among youth. While nicotine pouches may have a role for adults who are trying to quit smoking, evidence shows they are not risk-free. These products contain nicotine, which is addictive and can harm the developing brain. This is why clear guidelines are in place to ensure they are used appropriately and not marketed or flavoured in ways that attract youth. Our priority is to protect the health of Canadians, especially our next generation.

Jamil Jivani (Bowmanville—Oshawa North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the very same government that likes to push so-called safe

supply drugs into our communities now wants to point out nicotine as a problem for adult usage. Health Canada set a target for 2035 to reduce the number of Canadians smoking to less than 5%. The government should have no excuses for making alternatives to cigarettes available wherever cigarettes are sold, such as corner stores, gas stations, wherever.

The question remains. When will the Liberals do the right thing? When will they free the Zyn?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of young people, the first new medical school in the GTA in over 100 years in Brampton is happening, with a \$25-million investment in budget 2025. This government is stepping up to support the new TMU medical school to train the next generation of doctors in Brampton. This is how we are empowering young Canadians across the country. This is how we build Brampton and Canada strong.

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal government, it is easier for Canadians to continue smoking than quit. Since former Liberal health minister Mark Holland launched his personal crusade against cigarette alternatives, everything we have heard from the government is smoke and mirrors. While nicotine pouches are banned from pharmacies, cigarettes can be bought anywhere. It makes no sense.

Instead of blowing more smoke, will the minister finally give Canadians a real chance to quit, and free the Zyn?

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, addiction is a serious issue, and the Conservatives are making it blatantly political, which is wrong. Regardless of where people can access it, nicotine causes addiction to nicotine. The Conservatives should be absolutely ashamed of themselves. We have produced good numbers on nicotine and cigarette reductions. We continue to be there to improve the health of Canadians and make sure these are available at the appropriate time, and never for children, never for children.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a proud Acadian who represents the riding of Madawaska—Restigouche—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[English]

The Speaker: Fridays are usually quiet; this must be a special day.

The hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, as a proud Acadian who represents the riding of Madawaska—Restigouche in the House, I care about the development of our francophone communities.

Since 2022, we have seen a major increase in francophone immigration outside Quebec. It is crucial that we maintain that trend to support the vitality of our communities. Since we are celebrating National Francophone Immigration Week, I would like to ask the minister to tell us how our new immigration levels plan will help ensure the demographic growth of francophone communities across Canada.

• (1200)

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his dedication. In 2023 and 2024, we surpassed our target for French-speaking permanent residents outside Quebec. Today, while stabilizing the overall intake of permanent residents, we still plan to welcome over 30,000 francophones every year for the next three years by increasing the francophone immigration target. That is how we will meet our 12% target and strengthen communities everywhere.

[English]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, non-citizen Abraham Daniel Abraham was convicted of criminally abusing his dog, Simba. Abraham repeatedly punched and kicked Simba and tied him to a pole so high that his front legs dangled off the ground. Simba could not lie down or sit and was left crying and yelping, yet Abraham remains in Canada with no deportation guarantee. That is disgusting.

Why has the immigration minister not strengthened the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act to make sure non-citizens convicted of serious crimes, like Simba's abuser, are swiftly deported?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a robust system of removals and inadmissibility that enables us to take action. I will commit to the member opposite to looking into it and will get back to her.

The circumstances behind the incident she refers to are abhorrent, and I condemn it wholeheartedly.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that we have an immigration minister who is so weak that she will not even stand up to answer questions like this. I asked about the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, but she will not stand up, so I will ask again.

The case I referred to is so disgusting. There have been so many cases like it: serious criminals and non-citizens who need to be deported.

Will the immigration minister stand up and commit to strengthening the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act to make sure that non-citizens who are convicted of serious crimes are actually deported?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we

are delivering for Canadians every day. The government's highest priority is the safety and security of Canadians.

Let me be clear: A foreign national who has been convicted of a crime is inadmissible to Canada. We work with the IRB, we work with CBSA, we work with CSIS and we work with the RCMP to ensure that we deport anyone who needs to be deported.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that excepts a Pakistani national who was convicted of raping his niece. He came into Canada while being on the U.K. sex offender list. It also excepts Simba's abuser.

The government does not take the issue seriously. In fact it is so bad that this week the Liberals admitted that they did not even know how many convicted criminals they gave citizenship to. Seriously, they put that in an Order Paper question.

I will give the minister one more opportunity. How many citizenships did she issue to criminals in Canada? Her department could not answer that this week.

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: Foreign nationals who are convicted of a crime are inadmissible to Canada.

On this side of the House, we take the safety and security of all Canadians very seriously, and we act. We work with our RCMP, policing partners and CBSA to ensure that we act in accordance with the law and with the immigration and refugee protection regulations and act.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, while many Canadians are looking at the \$78-billion deficit number in the budget, many others, while concerned about that deficit, are also wondering about our children and grandchildren and the growing ecological deficit from lack of action on climate and lack of action to protect nature. We look at this budget and want to weep.

Those of us who are grandparents and seniors right across this country, and young people, want to know if the government will step up and tackle the generational ecological deficit.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for her advocacy.

Points of Order

In the throne speech, we said we must fight climate change, and our new climate competitiveness strategy includes measures to reduce emissions, including by strengthening industrial carbon pricing, incentivizing investments to reduce carbon and mobilizing private capital.

We are also creating a new youth climate corps to empower young people in the fight against climate change. We are committed to protecting nature by halting and reversing nature loss and biodiversity loss through reinforced efforts to conserve 30%—

• (1205)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith has the floor.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have introduced the most costly and largest budget deficit in history outside COVID. It will drive up the cost of food, housing and everything else that Canadians buy. In Nanaimo—Ladysmith, food bank use is up and donations are down, in part because the people who formerly supported these services now increasingly need to use them to make ends meet.

Liberals had the chance to lower food costs for Canadians by scrapping the industrial carbon tax, but they increased it instead, driving up the cost of everything needed to grow our food.

Why is the Prime Minister making food more expensive?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, jobs, housing and infrastructure are what the budget has, including through our investment and commitment to accelerating the additions to reserve process. In October I was in Nanaimo, celebrating with the Snuneymuxw First Nation the addition of 195 acres. With this, the first nation is looking to build a \$2.3-billion mixed-use development. That means great housing for youth and for everyone on reserve. That means great jobs during construction, and after, on reserve.

We look forward to working with first nations to accelerate more additions to reserves. We hope all parties will support this and the budget.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal budget is deeply flawed in many important areas, but the climate plan has become a sick joke, at a time when our collective home is on fire. It abandons the greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2030. It eliminates the emissions cap for the oil and gas sector. The Liberal climate strategy boils down to tax credits for critical minerals and carbon capture, which basically amounts to subsidies for mining and oil companies.

How can the Liberals call this a generational budget when it ignores the future of generations to come?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. This government will continue to fight climate change, and we will do so across our government. This budget makes it clear that we are going to strengthen industrial carbon pricing, reduce methane emissions and implement the clean fuel regulations. Furthermore, we are going to have tax credits for clean electricity. That is good for all Canadians and especially for Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, friendship centres are lifelines for indigenous people in urban communities, providing food, housing, safety, culture and belonging. The urban indigenous population is growing rapidly, and friendship centres are already stretched past the breaking point. Their core funding runs out in March. Budget 2025 offered nothing. Without stable permanent funding, programs will be cut, and doors will close. This is not reconciliation; it is abandonment.

When will the government commit to renewing the critical funding to support indigenous peoples with long-term, secure and stable funding?

Ginette Lavack (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we put indigenous children, families and essential services first.

The new government is innovating to better serve Canadians by improving efficiencies and by coordinating across all departments, but the federal government has a distinct duty to indigenous people and a key opportunity to strengthen a renewed, respectful relationship. That is why the priority in budget 2025 is to protect critical services like water, housing and infrastructure in community and to ensure that changes made strengthen service delivery.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am asking for unanimous consent to redo my S. O. 31.

• (1210)

The Speaker: Does the House give its consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Routine Proceedings

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, this week the Liberal government released its 10th budget, the costliest deficit outside COVID and double what the Prime Minister's predecessor left behind.

The Prime Minister broke every promise he made. He promised to keep the deficit at \$62 billion, a level the Parliamentary Budget Officer had already called "unsustainable", yet it has now ballooned to \$80 billion. He said that he would lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but both debt and inflation are rising. He promised to spend less, but he added \$90 billion more; that is \$5,400 in extra inflationary spending per household.

Families in London are paying the price. Groceries, gas, rent and mortgages keep climbing while paycheques fall further behind. Canadians already spend more on debt interest than on health care. The budget at this time is simply irresponsible.

Conservatives stand for an affordable budget and an affordable life. Londoners deserve hope, homes and a future they can afford.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 2025-26

A message from Her Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (B) for the financial year ending March 31, 2026, was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Speaker to the House.

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the supplementary estimates (B), 2025-26.

* * *

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CANADA

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table, in both official languages, "Public Accounts of Canada 2025". The Auditor General of Canada has provided an unqualified audit opinion on the Government of Canada's financial statements.

* * *

AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 8(2) of the Auditor General Act, a report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons entitled "Commentary on the 2024-2025 Financial Audits".

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(g), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

* * *

DEPARTMENTAL RESULTS REPORTS 2024-25

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table, in both official languages, on behalf of 90 departments and agencies, the departmental results reports for 2024-25.

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 11 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

● (1215)

[*Translation*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the following reports of the Canadian Branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, or APF.

The first report concerns the Bureau meeting of the APF and the Parliamentary Conference on Francophone Cooperation in the Areas of Sustainable Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change. This meeting was held in Can Tho, Vietnam, from January 21 to 24, 2025.

The second report concerns the meeting of the APF Political Committee. This meeting was held in Dakar, Senegal, from April 28 to 30, 2025.

The third report concerns the meetings of the APF Network of Women Parliamentarians and the Network of Young Parliamentarians. These meetings were held in the city of Québec, in the beautiful province of Quebec, from May 20 to 21, 2025.

The fourth report concerns the Bureau meeting and the 50th annual session of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie. This meeting was held in Paris, France, from July 9 to 13, 2025.

The fifth report concerns the parliamentary diplomacy mission to Costa Rica, which took place in San José, Costa Rica, from October 1 to 3, 2025.

* * *

[*English*]

AN ACT TO AMEND CERTAIN ACTS IN RELATION TO SURVIVOR PENSION BENEFITS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-256, An Act to amend certain Acts in relation to survivor pension benefits.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to introduce this bill just ahead of Remembrance Day next week. The bill seeks to eliminate the gold digger clause that penalizes the spouses of veterans who married after the age of 60.

Routine Proceedings

As the law currently stands, these spouses are stripped of any survivor benefits. This archaic relic of the early 1990s is a sexist holdover of a bygone era. It was as sexist then as it is today. My hope is that we, as parliamentarians, and more broadly as a society, have evolved enough to agree that there is no excuse for continuing to accept the errors of the ways of the past by allowing outdated discriminatory policies to remain in place.

To that end, my bill would amend certain acts related to survivor pension benefits so that spouses of veterans, Canadian military, RCMP and federal civil servants who marry after the age of 60 are not punished for having found love later in life.

I want to thank the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for seconding this bill.

I would highlight that it was a decade ago when former prime minister Justin Trudeau mandated his then minister to address this archaic clause. It is shameful that it remains within our statutes today.

Lastly, on the eve of Remembrance Day, as we honour those who have bravely served our country with courage and dignity, I encourage the government to honour them and their families, not only with words but also with action, by finally eliminating this punitive and sexist policy, which is a remaining blight on the country our veterans have sacrificed so much to protect.

I want to thank former MP Rachel Blaney and former MP Irene Mathysen for also tabling this bill in the past.

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

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The other day the Speaker made a ruling on members standing up to address petitions, saying that they are supposed to be sticking to the essence of the petition. I would just ask that we review the comments for private members' bills and likewise have the Speaker provide guidance on what is expected when a private member's bill is introduced.

The Deputy Speaker: It is noted. I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary, and we will take it under advisement.

* * *

PETITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY

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

Over the last two years, I have risen on behalf of the over 2,000 people who live in Swan River and the surrounding area who have signed this petition to voice their concerns about crime. The petitioners in Swan River have seen their petitions presented in the House over and over again, more than 75 times, yet the government has not addressed their concerns.

Unfortunately, citizens and business owners in the Swan River Valley continue to suffer. The petitioners say that Liberal policy has allowed violent repeat offenders to run free, instead of putting these criminals in jail, which is where they belong. Petitioners know that

there is so much more action that could be taken to combat crime and make the streets in Swan River a safer place.

This is why the people of Swan River continue to demand jail, not bail, for violent repeat offenders. I will always support the good people of Swan River—

• (1220)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for York—Durham.

INVASIVE SPECIES

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition today on behalf of the town of Georgina, specifically the residents in the community of Keswick, about a new invasive aquatic species known as water soldier.

It was discovered in Cook's Bay, in Lake Simcoe, in 2024 and confirmed by water soldier working group, particularly because of the efforts of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters.

Water soldier, this invasive aquatic species, is a threat to human health because it is serrated and can injure people. It is also threat to our local agriculture because of its proximity to the Holland River, an important water source for agricultural operations.

The petitioners are calling on the government to do three things: list water soldier as an invasive species; nominate a single federal department to take responsibility; and allocate sufficient funding.

I would note that, instead, the government cut \$700,000 from the Canada Water Agency.

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

The petition was going along so great until the last point, when the member decided to include his own personal commentary about the petition. He is a new member, so perhaps the Speaker could remind him of the rules for introducing a petition.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the chief government whip for that reminder. Yes, the Speaker has made a ruling reminding both new and returning members to keep petitions short when tabling them and to not refer to whether they support the contents of the petition personally but to just report to the House the contents of said petition.

To the chief government whip, I was about to rise to interrupt the member because he was over time at that point.

The parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has the floor.

The Budget

JUSTICE

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I table a petition that was circulated by Debbie Johnson, who is a very strong advocate. The petition is asking Parliament to do more for families of victims. She had a personal tragedy with respect to her son Adam, who was murdered. She is hoping that we would see a more collaborative approach to ensuring that there is justice for all, including for her son and her family.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of 23,576 Canadians to present e-petition 6790. Canadians have spoken, loud and clear, and have displayed their opposition to the Liberals' EV mandate, which is economically harmful and risks job losses and delayed investment in Canada's auto sector, which is already dealing with the crippling effects of tariffs coming from south of the border.

This petition calls on the government to repeal the federal EV mandate, ensure consumer choice, rather than government-imposed quotas, and adopt policies that improve EV affordability.

FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring forward a petition on behalf of Canadians who are calling for enhanced support for friendship centres. The petitioners highlight that friendship centres are vital community hubs that provide culturally appropriate services in health, education, housing, employment and youth programming. The petitioners note that governments have increasingly relied on these centres to respond to socio-economic conditions, climate emergencies and the toxic drug crisis, yet federal funding has not kept pace with inflation or the real cost of services since 2005.

The petitioners therefore call on the Government of Canada to provide enhanced, stable and predictable funding; invest in the modernization of facilities; and fully recognize the critical role that friendship centres play in reconciliation and in supporting indigenous peoples across urban, rural and remote communities.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356 and 357 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

• (1225)

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in the previous portion of Routine Proceedings, the member for Kingston and the Islands suggested that I introduced my personal opinion while presenting the petition. I wanted to clarify that I did not do so. Instead, I simply recited a fact from the budget, so that was not my personal—

The Deputy Speaker: This is a matter of debate. I took in what was mentioned by all members. Going back, there is a ruling from the Speaker on the length that petitions are supposed to be. That is definitely debate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

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 and of the amendment.

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of sharing my time with my friend, the chief whip of the Bloc Québécois and member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

Before I begin my speech, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the 25 mayors in my riding who had the pleasure of being elected or re-elected. I would also like to congratulate all the municipal councillors who were elected on November 2 in Quebec's municipal elections. I want to assure them of my collaboration, as always. Together, we can achieve big changes and transform the world.

I am pleased to speak to the budget. As I was saying to one of my colleagues, I have no problem voting against the budget. In my riding, throughout the election, the voice of seniors was heard. In the riding of Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, seniors aged 65 and over represent nearly 20% of the population. I can confirm that seniors got their message across. People who receive OAS and GIS get a little less than \$2,000 a month.

I do not know what the situation is like in my colleagues' ridings, but in my riding, there is virtually no housing available for less than \$1,100 or \$1,200 per month. I would say that is a major obstacle for our seniors. That is what people talked to me about during the election campaign. They were saying how outrageous the situation had become. They asked me why our voices were not being heard when it comes to increasing OAS. We know that the Liberal government continues to discriminate against seniors between the ages of 65 and 74, whose pensions did not increase. Every year, their purchasing power diminishes because the cost of everything is going up, while their income remains the same. I find that unacceptable.

The Budget

I often say that I spent my career helping seniors as a social worker and housing manager for seniors. I can say that there is absolutely nothing in this budget to support seniors so that they can get through the difficult times we are currently experiencing. There is nothing except the New Horizons for Seniors program. It is insulting to see that this is the only budget measure specifically for seniors. I find that really shameful.

Tax incentives could have been offered so that healthy seniors who want to work would not have to work for peanuts. If a senior wants to work, their income should increase, not decrease. Those who receive the GIS, who work and earn a certain income, have to pay taxes. That does not necessarily improve their living conditions. The tax rate is high for people who earn an income in addition to receiving the GIS. There is nothing for seniors and it really bothers me to see how insensitive the government is toward seniors, both in the Trudeau era and now.

The government also lacks sensitivity when it comes to infrastructure. Provincial finance ministers had requested \$100 billion over 10 years to do major work on infrastructure related to health and social services and municipal infrastructure such as water and sewer systems.

Infrastructure is what allows municipalities to deliver more density in housing. It provides access to water and ensures proper water treatment, for example. That is expensive. There is a lot of catching up to do when it comes to all this municipal infrastructure. It was an important request, yet what do we see in the budget? It looks like there is an investment of \$50 billion when we first read the budget, but then we realize that it is not really \$50 billion in new money. Instead, it is about \$9 billion.

• (1230)

I do not know if people are aware of this, but a hospital is being built in Vaudreuil, in my riding. Building a hospital costs at least \$4 billion or \$5 billion dollars. That is for a single hospital, so it is understandable that the provincial leaders are extremely disappointed with the budget. Quebec, for one, had high hopes of receiving at least a few billion dollars a year to be able to meet its significant infrastructure demands. Now, the Minister of Finance is telling us that Quebec will be getting approximately \$375 million a year. To give an idea of the scale, Quebec spends about \$19 billion on infrastructure each year. What they are offering is peanuts. It is not nearly enough to enable municipalities and provinces to meet the challenges of modernizing their infrastructure as well as meet infrastructure requirements for schools, hospitals and long-term care facilities.

What the budget tells Quebec and the provinces is that the federal government is going to aggravate their public finance crisis. That is extremely serious because we send part of our taxes to the federal government and Ottawa is supposed to redistribute them. What we are seeing is that the government is keeping that money for itself and choosing what it wants to invest in. The choices it is making are not in the best interests of Quebec and Quebecers. I think that the Minister of Finance made that quite clear.

Members know that health transfers are something that I care a lot about. As I said, I worked in health and social services in Quebec, in both the independent community system and the public sys-

tem, and I can tell you one thing: Right now, everyone is stretched thin because they are trying to do more with less and meet the desperate needs of citizens. They have less with which to respond to those needs because the money is in Ottawa. I heard the Minister of Industry say that the government increased health transfers in the budget, but if we look carefully, we see that it is not a real increase because the system costs are higher. They are at 6%. There is a 5% increase, but if we look at the fine print, we see that some programs will be done away with as of 2028 and that funding will be cut.

That is unacceptable. If the government is aware of the Quebec communities' needs, then it is aware that we need a massive injection of money. I think that Quebec is now on its sixth health and social services reform because we are trying everything we can to better meet the health and social services needs of Quebecers with the money that we have, so I am sure the government will understand why I am so disappointed.

What also surprised me was how the small business sector reacted. I read that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business has said that, no matter how much its members read, they could not find anything for SMEs. Everything is going to the oil companies. There is loads of money for oil companies, but nothing really meaningful for our SMEs in terms of tax relief or support, especially for companies that are being hit hard by the tariff war with the United States. I am talking about small businesses involved in the secondary processing of aluminum, for example. There is very little on the table for them, or at least that is what the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is saying. It is the oil companies that really hit the jackpot with this budget. Oil companies are getting more than \$100 billion in renewed and increased tax credits.

When I am sitting across from a vulnerable senior, I have to try to explain why this government decided to spoil the oil companies, which are already very well supported and have plenty of money. Directing those funds to oil companies means two things. It means the government is turning its back on seniors, municipalities and the provinces. It also means it is giving up on the fight against climate change. We in the Bloc Québécois are calling it climate capitulation. Everything related to climate change has been dropped, and I think that is shameful.

• (1235)

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the budget contains a lot of good news for Quebecers, especially those in the riding of our colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj, with the extension of the Magdalen Islands airport runway. The Bloc Québécois has championed this project a number of times.

The Budget

There are also investments for the Forillon shipyards in Gaspé. Montreal's Biosphere is going to receive \$9 million over three years. Other investments are on the way for a sports centre in Montreal North. These infrastructure investments are priorities for Quebecers.

I would like to know whether my colleague is going to vote in favour of the budget and support these important investments, some of which the Bloc Québécois has been calling for for quite some time.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, whom I appreciate, for his question. This gives me an opportunity to tell him that it is about time, since it has been quite a few years.

My colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj said that we have been asking for this money for the airport runway for years. It is about time. Yes, it is good, but is it enough? Is it enough to convince seniors and Quebec's finance minister to support the budget? I do not think so.

I believe that the Liberals have a duty to ensure that the infrastructure they are responsible for runs smoothly. It is great that they are doing this for the Magdalen Islands, but, honestly, there are other more pressing matters that are missing from this budget.

[*English*]

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question I have for my Bloc colleague is with respect to the question of privilege the Bloc raised earlier about the budget with the annexes only being presented in a digital format.

Within that, there is reference to about 75 legislative changes that would impact different demographics in Canada, particularly seniors. One of the things it is bringing back, which is currently in Bill C-2, is this restriction on \$10,000 in cash. I just want to know if the member has similar concerns around seniors.

There are minority communities, like the Amish and Old Order Mennonites, who do not use phones or Internet and do not have access to technology. I have this concern about, basically, bringing things in through an omnibus bill and the impact it would have on seniors.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, we responded to the question of privilege. We agree with the member that what happened is quite incomprehensible, as we said. The government cannot withhold documents or make a mistake of this magnitude. It has consequences. All of this has been documented.

I also agree with my colleague that we should not put all our eggs in the basket of modernization through automation. I have to accompany my father to Service Canada because he gets lost. People must be able to navigate all these services. I think we need to modernize, but we also need to take into account the needs of the most vulnerable people. It is not always easy for them because they are vulnerable, but also because of where they live, where Internet and other services are not always accessible.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my colleague for her excellent, heartfelt speech, as usual.

We used to have a Liberal government that drafted budgets to please the NDP. Now we have a Liberal government that drafts budgets to please the Conservatives. They never draft budgets to please Quebecers.

I would like to know how my colleague feels as a Quebecker in this Parliament. What would our best future look like?

• (1240)

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question.

I said from the outset that I have been in the House of Commons for almost 12 years. I have no problem saying no to this budget because it has absolutely nothing to do with us. It certainly does not meet the needs of Quebecers.

This once again confirms my belief that I am not in the right Parliament. My true place will be in the parliament of the country of Quebec.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I begin this speech in good spirits because my esteemed colleague and I just did some pretty impressive stickhandling there.

I, too, am pleased to speak about the budget today and provide some explanations to the public. This is important because misinformation is going to circulate and, unfortunately, the two major parties are going to throw around empty slogans. They will say that the Bloc Québécois is only here to vote against everything that is proposed.

As everyone knows, that is inherently false. The Bloc Québécois members are here to represent the interests of Quebecers. Until we become a sovereign country, there must be enough of us here with significant influence to protect the interests of our people. That is what we are doing, and I think we are doing it extremely well. We are generally respected in Parliament and seen as the adults in the room. We have been over this many times. I will prove my point by explaining why we are going to oppose this budget.

To begin with, we asked for a little more fiscal discipline. We expected serious planning for the future. However, we are being presented with deficits larger than those of the Trudeau era. That is quite an achievement in and of itself.

On top of that, the government is using some pretty creative accounting. We are being told that, yes, it is a big deficit, but really, at the end of the day, it is not all that huge because \$45 billion of it counts as assets. We are being told that paying the mortgage is not the same as paying for groceries. We agree on the substance. However, if we take a closer look at the budget, if we read the fine print and really look at the details, it becomes clear that this budget is a sham and a scam. That is what my colleague was explaining earlier. The Liberals would have us believe that transfers to the provinces are expenditures on federal government assets. Come on. That is the first point I wanted to make.

The Budget

Let me turn to what the Bloc Québécois is calling for. My colleague spoke in detail about seniors and old age security. Once again, the answer we got was no. However, I want to reassure the people watching us at home that we will never give up on that, not until we get it. We will continue to ask for that. That is the first reason we are saying no to this budget.

Next, I want to talk about the carbon tax and the robbery that occurred during the election. The government took money from Quebecers to buy votes in the rest of Canada with cheques for a carbon tax that had not yet been paid. What makes this move all the more despicable is that we, in Quebec, are still acting responsibly. We still have a carbon exchange that is working well, and its alleged impact on grocery prices is not real. What the Conservatives keep saying about that is untrue.

The proof is that the federal carbon tax was scrapped in the other provinces and yet grocery prices did not go down. What better proof could there be that the slogans we have been hearing for months are empty?

In the meantime, our money was used for a rebate for people in the other provinces for a carbon tax that they had not paid. This was done to buy votes just days before the election. I fail to understand why the media and society at large did not protest louder. We see egregious things like that happen when we sit in Parliament.

Let us talk about loans for first-time homebuyers. The budget offers something, but it is not quite what we wanted. We need to do better to help people.

We asked for transfers for housing, social housing in particular. The last time there were federal transfers for social housing, it took three years for Quebec to get its money because the federal government kept trying to attach strings to it. That does not bother the other provinces because they think that their government is the federal government. They accept that the money they are given comes with strings attached. In Quebec, we are the distinct society that everyone here refuses to recognize. Some will say that Parliament did recognize it, but it was an insignificant motion that means absolutely nothing. Just look at the actual Constitution. On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the referendum, many people will say that Canada is the best country in the world. If it were the best country in the world, it would not have left one of the two nations out of the Constitution for more than 30 years. This goes back to 1982. It is awful. Sometimes we get tired of hearing these platitudes.

With regard to infrastructure transfers, the government is investing a measly \$9 billion. Since my colleague already talked about this issue, I will just address it briefly. This amount is not enough for infrastructure from coast to coast to coast, as the Liberals like to say. If that money is divided up fairly, there will not be much money for anyone. It might be enough to feed the parking meter, but I am not even sure about that.

• (1245)

There is nothing in this budget for indigenous housing. Although we live in a G7 country, there are indigenous reserves that still do not have clean drinking water as we speak. That is appalling. Meanwhile, the Liberals are giving pretty speeches about how happy they are with the budget.

My colleague spoke at length about ending oil subsidies, so I will just go over that quickly. I cannot understand how elected officials can sleep at night when they are refusing to increase old age security for seniors aged 65 and older, while handing out fiscal goodies to oil companies that make billions of dollars in profits. Then they go on and on about the equalization program, but they are looking at it in isolation. Quebecers receive the least per capita, but this is always presented in a populist way that makes people think that Quebec is getting tons of money. I would like to remind members that we are paying 22% of the oil subsidies. There is no reason why Quebecers should be giving gifts to western oil companies. When will the government understand that?

Now let us talk about welcoming asylum seekers. Quebec took in 50% of the asylum seekers from among Canada's 10 provinces and three territories. The federal government is not even willing to reimburse our expenses. We were welcoming and generous. We welcomed people and we took care of them, yet the government refuses to reimburse the \$700 million we spent on doing that. That is not right.

Employment insurance has not changed. Health transfers are not keeping up with inflation. This means that they are making cuts. Now the Liberals would have us believe that they are generous and kind, that they are being good to us.

We proposed bringing back the wage subsidy support program that was implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, because it worked well, but the Liberals are not interested. We have forestry and aluminum companies laying people off, and we are afraid of losing that legacy knowledge. At the same time, they are changing the temporary foreign worker program too abruptly—I am choosing my words carefully—which means that our businesses, our SMEs, for which there is absolutely nothing in the budget, as my colleague pointed out, are being forced to let go of skilled, trained, experienced employees who have learned French and whose children go to school here. Employees have to leave because new ones have just arrived and the quotas have been exceeded. Can they not get three years to adjust? These are all things that make us want to sigh.

Let us talk about agriculture. This is an issue that I have been raising here since 2019 and that is very important to me. There are some minor items in the budget, and I will be a good sport about them. I think that modernizing the Canadian Food Inspection Agency can only be a good thing. However, the Pest Management Regulatory Agency lacks the resources it needs to be more effective. We are currently working on this. There is a lack of resources for the next generation of farmers. Farm Credit Canada could finance 40-year low-interest loans, which would cost the government nothing.

The Budget

Our beef farmers in Quebec are having a hard time rebuilding their herds right now because the price of calves has gone up and financial institutions are reluctant to lend them money. A financial institution is not a charity. Sometimes financial institutions try to pass themselves off as such, but they exist to make money. They look at risk. They tell the farmer that the price of calves has gone up, but that by the time the farmer wants to sell the meat, the price is not going to be as high, so they do not want to provide financing. Is that not the role of the government?

The government is going to ask us to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. However, Quebec will produce about half as much beef next year because farmers cannot afford to rebuild their herds. Then the government will make speeches about how the people who feed us are doing such an extraordinary job. Can it please be consistent?

For example, we requested an exemption from the excise tax on alcohol, such as mead. There was a comma missing in the paragraph when it went to committee, because it was drafted so quickly. Berry-based alcohols are not included. We have been asking for this for a long time. The former finance minister was from Toronto, so her lack of awareness was understandable, but the current Minister of Finance represents the riding right next to mine in Mauricie. He comes from the countryside, from a rural area. He should understand that agricultural producers need a break.

• (1250)

Regardless of any sops they throw our way, we have a moral obligation to vote against this budget. Since the government is proposing tons of negative measures while dismissing all of our requests, are we going to vote for the budget if it offers to throw in one of our long-standing minor requests as a small favour? Certainly not.

I ask members to vote against this budget because it is bad, unreasonable and disrespectful of future generations.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief comment. Concerning support for businesses affected by the tariff war, we had already announced several important measures, before the budget, for the aluminum and softwood lumber sectors. Together with the Business Development Bank of Canada and CED, or the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, we will continue to support the sectors.

How can my Bloc Québécois colleagues reconcile the fact that they are going to vote against the budget—which is clear—with the thought that they are going to end up voting with the Conservatives, who want to get rid of the industrial carbon tax and are extremely pro-oil?

How do they reconcile those two things?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it was intentional, but my colleague just gave me a great assist.

First, for businesses, I mentioned the wage subsidy. I would like my colleague to work behind the scenes to implement this, because our businesses need it to avoid losing legacy knowledge.

My colleague asked me a question, but I will turn it back around on him. I am well aware that he has worked in Quebec and that he

knows the reality we face, including the money that is needed to fund the health care system. How does he reconcile his decision to vote for a budget with the knowledge that health care transfers are actually decreasing in real terms?

We are not choosing between voting with the Conservatives or with the Liberals. Today, we have to choose between voting with the Conservatives, who want to get rid of the industrial carbon tax, or with the Liberals, who already got rid of the general carbon tax. This tax was beneficial for people with lower incomes. We do not look at who we are voting with. We look at who we are voting for.

We always vote for Quebec and Quebecers.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just last week, the member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj created a working group to extend the Magdalen Islands airport runway. In an interview with Radio-Canada, he said that the runway's current condition is hindering economic development. There is some good news in the budget this week. We will fund the extension of the requested runway. Another piece of good news for local residents is that we are also confirming that we are going to reduce the cost of fares on ferries to the Magdalen Islands by 50%.

Is the Bloc Québécois really going to vote against a budget that proposes meaningful measures for the Magdalen Islands?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to investments in the Magdalen Islands, it is pretty ironic that there was a minister in that riding for over 10 years, that these investments were promised for 10 years and that they were never made. Now that a Bloc Québécois member has taken over the riding, the government has suddenly decided to keep its promise. Sometimes we wonder whether the budget is being used for electioneering purposes. This is a good thing for the people in the Magdalen Islands. It is good news and we will take it, but I cannot help but feel skeptical about the motive behind this measure.

The government is saying that we need to vote in favour of the budget because it contains all sorts of good things. I mentioned some those good things earlier in my speech. For example, on the agricultural file, I mentioned the modernization of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. That said, the government is claiming to be improving risk management systems and AgriStability coverage, but when we read the fine print, as my colleague said earlier, we see that the government is not putting money into those things. It is investing \$33 million, but there is another line underneath that that says that it is taking \$33 million away. It is taking money out of the system. Where is it going to make those cuts? It is always like this.

We want transparency, integrity and intellectual honesty. We would be very comfortable voting against the budget.

• (1255)

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his excellent speech, my colleague summed up the reasons the Bloc Québécois will be voting for Quebecers.

The Budget

I would like my colleague to talk about the regions. He talked about his riding. I come from a rural region where the forestry sector is not getting its fair share of the budget, and neither is the aluminum sector. Workers in seasonal industries and in the fishing industry have also been left out in the cold.

I would like my colleague to talk about the fact that the government also forgot about the regions of Quebec.

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, my very esteemed colleague does indeed represent a magnificent region.

The regions have been neglected. The current government is only tending to the things that might pay off come election time. That is the answer. The government thinks it has nothing to gain from the regions. It threw some crumbs at the Gaspé Peninsula because it just lost a seat. That is all.

The government used to draft its budgets to appeal to the NDP for vote-grabbing purposes. Now it is appealing to the Conservatives for vote-grabbing purposes and maybe with a view to getting a majority. That is the sad reality.

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Davenport.

I am pleased to rise today to proudly represent the people of Beauport—Limoilou. It is the proudest and most beautiful riding in Canada, and representing it is the greatest honour I have ever been given.

Today, I will be giving my speech in two parts.

First, I want to talk about the new economic reality. For over 20 years, I worked in the banking sector, where stability and certainty were the very foundation of any business' success. Everything was built on trust, trends, certainty and continuity. Later, while serving as president and CEO of the Quebec City chamber of commerce and industry, I noticed the same instinct at work, the instinct to strive for balance, to anticipate cycles and to build on a strong, lasting foundation.

These days, however, thanks to U.S. interventionism, that logic is crumbling. A new global economic order is emerging, one marked by uncertainty, rapid change and the constant redefinition of benchmarks. When I worked in banking, we often reminded our teams that the only constant was change. We always had to innovate, adapt and be agile, but we did so by choice. The predictability we once enjoyed no longer exists. Unpredictability has become the norm. However, we continue to move forward. Retreating or simply waiting are not an option.

In a context where the economic rules are being redefined at breakneck speed, our collective responsibility is to adapt in order to protect the foundations of our prosperity: our workers, our families, our businesses and our regions. This means rethinking our business models, diversifying our markets and focusing more on local processing and value-added production. We need to strengthen our supply chains, encourage innovation and support the strategic sectors that make us self-sufficient, whether in energy, agri-food, technology or advanced manufacturing.

We are also going to restore confidence among our entrepreneurs and communities, who are the true builders of our real economy.

Moving forward means refusing to give up. It means choosing creativity, collaboration and long-term vision. It means understanding that tomorrow's stability will no longer be based on repeating the past, but on our ability to leverage today's challenges into sustainable growth.

I would like to mention a highly successful book that has been translated into 40 languages and sold over 30 million copies. It is only 100 pages long. *Who Moved My Cheese?* by Spencer Johnson illustrates this transformation well. It tells the story of two mice and two little men living in a maze. Every day, they go out in search of their cheese, which symbolizes comfort, success and stability. One day, the cheese disappears. Some of them refuse to admit that it is gone, while others adapt and move on. This simple fable teaches a fundamental truth: Change is inevitable, and our survival depends on our ability to adapt.

Today, our economy is going through something similar. We have known for years where to find our "cheese": economic stability, secure jobs, a reliable supply chain and what seemed like sustainable prosperity. That model has changed. Yesterday's benchmarks are no longer a guarantee of future security. Faced with this transformation, we have two choices: We wait or we take action. Waiting means hoping that the cheese will reappear in its usual place. Taking action means accepting reality, anticipating change and charting new pathways toward growth.

The current economic emergency demands courage, agility and innovation. Whether we are talking about the energy transition, food sovereignty or industrial modernization, we need to forge ahead unafraid through the maze of a changing world, because one thing is certain: The cheese has moved and we have to move with it.

That was the first part of my speech.

● (1300)

These priorities are being translated into concrete action on the ground, right here in my riding of Beauport—Limoilou. I like to say that we are going to build Beauport—Limoilou strong. Starting in 2026-27, the Government of Canada is going to implement a provincial and territorial stream that will provide \$17.2 billion over 10 years to support infrastructure projects that improve the daily lives of the citizens in my riding. These investments will target housing by funding roads and water systems to improve access to our neighbourhoods, and they will also target health care by modernizing hospitals and essential infrastructure. In return, provinces and territories will be required to match federal investments, reduce development charges, and not levy other fees that hinder the housing supply. This is a meaningful and responsible partnership to build a stronger and more accessible Canada.

The Budget

Building Beauport—Limoilou strong also means stimulating productivity and investment in our businesses. To help our businesses grow, innovate and create good jobs, the government is implementing a productivity superdeduction, a set of enhanced tax incentives that support new capital investments. Thanks to this measure, businesses will be able to immediately write off a larger share of the cost of their new investments, whether they are for modern equipment, digital technologies, clean energy equipment, research and innovation assets or zero-emission vehicles.

By making investments fiscally more advantageous, this initiative stimulates productivity, accelerates business growth and makes Canada more competitive on the world stage. It is an ambitious policy that makes Canada a country of innovation, investment and shared prosperity. The budget also enhances the scientific research and experimental development program and invests \$925 million to create a public AI infrastructure, including a sovereign Canadian cloud.

Building Beauport—Limoilou strong also means making it easier to buy a first home. The government is taking action to make home ownership more affordable, especially for young families in my riding. As part of Bill C-4, the budget would completely eliminate the GST on the purchase of a first new home valued at up to \$1 million. This measure, combined with the \$13-billion, five-year Build Canada Homes program, supports the construction of affordable housing and restores hope to those who dream of becoming homeowners.

Building Beauport—Limoilou strong means finally asserting our sovereignty and supporting the pride of our businesses. The budget introduces a \$4.6-billion, five-year defence industrial strategy to strengthen our national capacity in security, innovation and strategic technologies. This strategy will support our businesses and researchers in the development of dual-use technologies, critical minerals, space capabilities and next-generation defence solutions. At the same time, the buy Canadian policy affirms a clear principle: public money must prioritize supporting Canadian businesses and goods. Nearly \$200 million will be invested to modernize federal procurement rules and encourage Canadian small and medium-sized businesses to participate in the public economy.

Budget 2025 lays out a coherent and forward-looking approach. It invests in infrastructure, supports families, encourages innovation and affirms our sovereignty. In Beauport—Limoilou and across Canada, these measures translate into jobs, opportunities and a better quality of life. This budget is about confidence and progress. It prepares Canada for tomorrow while meeting the needs of today. As mentioned earlier, we are choosing to take action. That means accepting reality, anticipating change and charting new pathways toward growth.

• (1305)

[English]

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in August, leaked text messages from the Minister of Environment's office revealed that the Liberals were considering cuts to the Canada Water Agency. Budget 2025 has confirmed that and shows a \$700,000 cut to the Canada Water Agency.

Budgets are about priorities. Could the hon. member tell me why the priority of the budget is tax breaks for luxury jets and yachts but tax cuts and less money for clean water in Ontario?

[Translation]

Steve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, this is a generational budget. It is an ambitious budget. It is a budget for our businesses, our families. It is a budget that benefits every segment of society. These are major investments.

Just think about the maritime corridor. Our corridor is mature, but it needs investment. Think about the corridor that the Arctic needs.

We are a global energy force. We are investing in every sector.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, whom I hold in high regard, for his excellent speech.

Before entering federal politics, the member for Beauport—Limoilou was the president and CEO of the Quebec City chamber of commerce and industry, so he has serious credibility when it comes to assessing the positive effects that our budget will have on entrepreneurs and our businesses.

I would like him to share his insights with us.

Steve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, I was the head of the chamber of commerce for four years, but I worked in the banking sector for 20 years.

The superdeduction for the purchase of capital assets is a major measure. It will enable businesses to automate, introduce robotics and get a tax deduction.

I can say that bankers are already calling businesses to help them finance their investment in order to modernize and be more productive. They know that they will also be eligible for a tax deduction that will make Canadian businesses the least taxed in the world, which is a real advantage in terms of global competitiveness.

My phone has been ringing off the hook since Tuesday. Business owners in Quebec are calling me to tell me how happy they are to finally have real help to modernize and increase their productivity.

[English]

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we know, it is Veterans' Week. This morning, I had a chance to meet with the Persian Gulf Veterans of Canada. The Liberals made a promise on page 12 of their election platform to Persian Gulf and Afghan veterans to award them proper recognition for their wartime service. In simple speak, what that means to veterans is battle honours. It has been a 35-year struggle to receive wartime service recognition and other health benefits.

The Budget

Why is there no mention of funding to make good on their promise in this budget? The government has a solemn obligation to those who served in Afghanistan, in the Persian Gulf and in other wars, and to fulfill a promise it made in the election campaign.

[*Translation*]

Steeve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, these are major, historic investments in defence. My colleague is talking about upcoming targeted investments. Right now, we are meeting targets that were planned for much later.

I know first-hand how important our soldiers are. My son is a member of the Canadian Armed Forces and will be deploying to Latvia in the coming year.

I understand the investments, I understand the needs of our military and I also understand veterans. Our government is doing something that has never been done before in the history of our country.

We are investing in defence. We are investing in our military personnel, in the people who serve us day after day, in those who will serve us in the future and who will be there to protect us.

● (1310)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize a nice statistic that came out today. There was an increase of 67,000 people who found a job. In September, I think it was just over 60,000. We have a Prime Minister and a government that are focused on building Canada strong.

Could the member provide his thoughts on how important that is for him and his constituents?

[*Translation*]

Steeve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, those numbers are encouraging. There are more good things to come.

There is the whole issue of retraining workers, which we are investing in because things are changing quickly. The job market is changing quickly, and needs are changing quickly. We will invest to help people retrain for these new, high-paying jobs.

[*English*]

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, as always, to rise in the House on behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport to speak to budget 2025.

This is a very important budget, delivered in extraordinary times. Let me begin by being very honest about where we are. The world is more dangerous and divided. The United States, our largest trading partner, is fundamentally changing its trade relationships. Our Prime Minister has called this moment “a rupture.” As he told the Council on Foreign Relations, “This is not a transition; this is a rupture. This is a sharp change in a short period of time”.

Normally, major changes come gradually. This time it has not. The way the United States is going about these changes is causing a massive break, forcing countries to pivot very quickly. It is inelegant, and there are pain points, not just for Canada but for G7 and OECD countries everywhere.

We have to focus on what we can control. Despite the headwinds, Canada has the fiscal capacity to transform our economy. This is our moment to build big, build bold and build now. As our Minister of Finance said, “This budget must be generational in its ambition.... There is no place for withdrawal, ambiguity or even standing still. Only for bold and swift action.”

In my constituency of Davenport, one of the top concerns I hear about is jobs. People are worried. Will they continue to have good-paying jobs? Will their kids have opportunities? Without a good-paying job, it is very hard to afford a home or live a decent life. When I meet young people in my riding, they say, “Please, we want to find work and good work experience.” They want a fair chance to build their future in our country.

I am proud that this budget invests heavily in training and in creating those opportunities. We are providing \$1.5 billion over three years to address youth unemployment, including 100,000 Canada summer jobs, which is 30,000 more than this past summer, and 55,000 work-integrated learning opportunities for students, which is 15,000 more than this year.

Davenport is also home to many union construction workers. I want to give a special shout-out to LiUNA and to the painters union, so LiUNA 183 and 506 and IUPAT 46. We are providing \$75 million over three years to expand the union training and innovation program for apprenticeship training in the Red Seal trades. For workers impacted by tariffs, we have \$570 million over three years for training and employment assistance, plus new workforce alliances bringing together employers, unions and industry groups that will ensure we stay on top of any ongoing supports.

We are also launching a youth climate corps, with \$40 million over two years to train young Canadians to respond to climate emergencies and strengthen community resilience.

Arts and culture are very important for the Davenport community. There are a lot of artists in my constituency, and I know they will be a little disappointed that there is not as much money in the budget for programming because these are difficult times and we have had to make some hard choices. However, let me be clear. Culture matters, and the arts matter. During uncertain times, we stay united by sharing—

● (1315)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member as the time for debate has elapsed.

It being 1:15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendment now before the House.

The question is as follows. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to House*]

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the amendment 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.

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

And the Clerk having announced the results of the vote:

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations is rising on a point of order.

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for Rural Development left his seat and returned to his seat before the vote was tabulated.

The Speaker: Unfortunately, the member's vote will not count because he left his seat.

The hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons is rising on the same point of order.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the member in question was—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am giving the floor to the hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the member in question was present. He momentarily lifted his body out of the seat for a second and returned to his seat immediately. He heard the question and cast his vote. I would ask the indulgence of members on the other side of the House to overlook this very brief, minor error.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: There is no unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 49*)

YEAS

Members

Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Champoux
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Fortin
Garon	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Idlout	Johns

Kwan
Lemire
McPherson
Perron
Savard-Tremblay
Ste-Marie

Aboultiaf
Aitchison
Albas
Allison
Anand
Anderson
Au
Baber
Bains
Baldinelli
Barlow
Battiste
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold
Bezan
Blair
Blois
Borrelli
Brassard
Brock
Caputo
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chartrand
Chen
Chi
Clark
Cody
Cooper
Coteau
Dalton
Dandurand
Davidson
Dawson
d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Doherty
Duclos
Duncan
Earle
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Fuhr
Gainey
Gasparro
Genuis
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Gourde
Greaves
Guay

The Budget

Larouche
May
Normandin
Plamondon
Simard
Thériault— 30

NAYS

Members

Acan
Al Soud
Ali
Alty
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Auguste
Bailey
Baker
Bardeesy
Barrett
Beech
Bendayan
Bexte
Bittle
Block
Bonk
Bragdon
Brière
Calkins
Carney
Casey
Chambers
Chang
Chatel
Chenette
Church
Cobena
Connors
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dancho
Danko
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
DeRidder
Desrochers
Dhillon
Diotte
Dowdall
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Epp
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gaheer
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)
Gladu
Gould
Grant
Groleau
Guglielmin

Private Members' Business

Guilbeault	Gull-Masty
Gunn	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardy	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Ho	Hoback
Hodgson	Hogan
Holman	Housefather
Hussen	Iacono
Jackson	Jaczek
Jansen	Jivani
Joly	Joseph
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Kelly	Khalid
Khanna	Kibble
Kirkland	Klassen
Kmiec	Konanz
Koutrakis	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Kuruc	Kusie
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lantsman	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	Lawrence
Lawton	LeBlanc
Lefebvre	Leitão
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Maloney	Mantle
Martel	Mazier
McCauley	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKenzie
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
McLean (Calgary Centre)	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)
Melillo	Ménard
Mendès	Menegakis
Michel	Miedema
Miller	Mingarelli
Moore	Morin
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Muys
Myles	Naqvi
Nater	Nathan
Nguyen	Noormohamed
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Petitpas Taylor
Poillievre	Powlowski
Provost	Ramsay
Rana	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Robertson
Rochefort	Romanado
Rood	Ross
Rowe	Royer
Ruff	Sahota
Saini	Sarai
Sari	Sawatzky
Scheer	Schieffe
Schmale	Seeback
Sgro	Sheehan
Shiple	Sidhu (Brampton East)

Sidhu (Brampton South)	Small
Sodhi	Solomon
Sousa	Steinley
Stevenson	St-Pierre
Strahl	Strauss
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	van Koeverden
Van Popta	Vandenbeld
Vien	Viersen
Villeneuve	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Watchorn	Waugh
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williamson	Yip
Zahid	Zerucelli
Zimmer	Zuberi— 306

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

JAIL NOT BAIL ACT

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC) moved that Bill C-242, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Justice Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the chamber to intervene on my private member's bill, the jail not bail act.

Before I dive into the topic at hand, I want to take a moment to honour the veterans. They are the brave men and women who served our country, who continue to serve and who have paid the ultimate sacrifice so that folks in the chamber could have healthy debate and fight for democracy, and so that Canadians can enjoy the freedoms we enjoy today. Next week, on the 11th, is Remembrance Day. I encourage all members of the public to please wear a poppy to honour their great legacy. We continue to pay tribute to their contributions to making Canada a free, true and prosperous nation.

When it comes to my jail not bail act, there are a lot of individuals and folks who I want to take the time to thank. There are those who helped draft the bill and those who came together to share their ideas. I am honoured that we have had elected officials from all walks of life, regardless of political—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member for a moment. There is a lot of noise in the chamber. Members are still having discussions while a member is speaking to his private member's bill. The clock has stopped, so I assure the member he will have his full time.

I invite all members to leave the House if they are having side conversations, so the member and the business of the House can continue.

Private Members' Business

• (1405)

Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not very far from the hon. colleague, and I could not hear. Therefore, I am asking for this member to be able to start over in speaking to his private member's bill.

The Deputy Speaker: We will start the clock at the beginning so that the member gets the full time. I could not even hear much of it. I will allow the member to begin his speech to his private member's bill.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, it is always a great honour to stand in this chamber to discuss such an important piece of legislation.

Before I dive right into Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, I would like to take a moment to reflect on and thank our veterans: those who have served and have paid the ultimate sacrifice and those brave men and women who continue to serve today for the freedoms that we have and we enjoy, even in this chamber, to have healthy debates and discussions and to make sure that Canada always remains a true, strong democracy. I encourage all members of the public and all hon. members to please wear a poppy. That is the least we can do. It is not a political symbol; it is an important task to honour those who have done so much for our freedoms.

It is always an honour to rise to speak to Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. I want to start by thanking the many individuals who have come together to make this piece of legislation possible.

I want to thank all those from different political parties and from various levels of government who shared their expertise, including municipal leaders, mayors, local councillors and MLAs. I thank first responders, who risk their lives every single day running to emergencies. Whether police officers, firefighters, paramedics or others, their input has been greatly valuable to me. I thank the Crown attorneys, who apply the law to defend the rights of Canadians, many of them from Oxford County, who shared their expertise when it comes to the bill.

I also thank the victims. It is very important for us to understand that the bill would put the rights of victims first because, at the end of the day, they should be the fundamental centrepiece of our justice system.

Locally from Oxford County, I want to give special thanks to our mayor, Jerry Acchione, from Woodstock. We have our Woodstock police chiefs from the Woodstock Police Service and some of their members who have helped me table the bill. I also thank various police associations from right across the country that were part of the consultations and put in letters of support for our bill.

In terms of community organizations, we have Cait Alexander, the founder of End Violence Everywhere; the One By One Movement; and the Oaks Revitalization movement, as well as Megan Walker, Debbie Henderson, C Trang, Scott Weller, Krissy Jennings and countless other victims and advocates who have shared their heartbreaking stories and who have asked us to bring the legislation forward so that Canadians can have safe streets again.

Those safe streets are not something that is so far out of reach. We can just think of a world where our kids could play on the streets and our seniors could go for a coffee with their friends and

talk about the good old days, when parents could drop their kids off at school and not worry about their safety. It was a country where we had vibrant communities, and we were not watching our backs. Law enforcement personnel were motivated and had the support of this chamber and the Criminal Code, and they knew that if they did their job, after risking their lives, they would have somebody who backed them up to keep repeat violent offenders away.

Again, it does not seem like something out of a fantasy. We used to have this in Canada. We had safe streets. However, when the current Liberal government took office, it brought in legislation that has disrupted our country but has moved out of balance the rights of victims and prioritized the rights of criminals. We saw that with Bill C-75, when the Liberals brought in the principle of restraint, which I will talk about later on in my remarks. That principle literally told judges that they have to release the accused person at the earliest opportunity and on the least restrictive conditions. The Liberals brought in bills like Bill C-5, which took away mandatory minimum sentencing and allowed for house arrest for some of the most violent crimes that are happening in our community.

My colleagues and I have been touring and meeting with stakeholders right across our country. We have gone coast to coast to coast, from Yukon all the way out to the east coast. We have met with families and with victims, and their stories are at the heart of Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. Their stories have motivated us to put forward a piece of legislation after so many years on a file the Liberals ignored.

I want to share a story that I have shared in the past in this chamber. I know the Minister of Justice has also met this family, so I want to thank him for that.

• (1410)

Bailey McCourt, as many of us know, was killed by her ex-partner. Just three hours after he was released on bail, he found her in a public parking lot four kilometres away. He took a hammer and smashed her head. Her life is gone. She is gone. She is no longer with us today.

I spoke to the stranger who held her hand at that very moment. His life has now been affected by this as well. He cannot believe what happened that day. He has lost faith in our system.

Debbie Henderson and Bailey's stepmom came to Ottawa just last week to testify at committee. Debbie shared some more stories with us. Bailey was a caring mother. When her friends and family held a celebration of life for Bailey, her kids thought it was a party for their mom and that she would be coming back home. The kids think she is alive. The kids still believe today that their mom is coming back to them and that all those celebrations are for their mom.

Private Members' Business

What is hard is that crime shows us that it is not just the lives that are lost directly but the effect it has on everyone else, from immediate family and neighbours to strangers just walking down the street, whole communities and our country. Bailey could have been any one of us. She did everything right, but the system failed her.

We had the same problem in Peel. I was there for a town hall. Flo Bellman and Paul Henderson shared their daughter's story. It was very similar to what happened to Bailey. Their daughter, Darian, was attacked, again by her former partner. He was arrested, charged and released five times. After the fifth time, he took a gun and shot and killed Darian.

When we are at these town halls, we should look into the eyes of these parents. We should see the pain in their eyes and the tears flowing down their cheeks. The strength they show in sharing their stories is not because they know their loved ones could come back. It is because they are pleading for help. They do not want to see another daughter shot by a repeat offender. I am sure there are many parents in this House, and this could happen to any one of our kids.

When it comes to extortion, we have seen a massive rise right across our country. In Edmonton last year, there was a massive extortion case. Some developments were burned down, and shots were fired. The police did their job and arrested the individual, someone who was charged with such a magnitude of carnage. They arrested him, they brought him before a judge, and thanks to Liberal bail policies, he was released. As soon as he was released, he packed his bag, took a flight and left the country.

That is how easy it is for criminals to operate in our communities. The Liberal bail laws have had no deterrence. They invite this chaos to our country. I know the Liberals have brought forward Bill C-14. I do want to give them credit for one thing. They have finally admitted that their policies, and their failure to act, have caused this crime wave. It was in their own government news release that under their watch, there has been a massive spike of violent crime in our communities. I do give them credit for that.

Conservatives will always welcome any changes to the Criminal Code that protect families. It might be a step in the right direction, but it is not going to fix the problem. The Liberals are putting band-aids on gunshot wounds, when the wound has to be treated and fixed.

• (1415)

We have to make significant changes to the system. We cannot just do photo ops and hope the problem is going to go away. That is why our plan, the jail not bail act, is focused on making systematic changes to Liberal bail laws.

First, the principle of restraint that I spoke about earlier today, the principle that allows repeat violent offenders to be released on the least restrictive conditions at the earliest opportunity, has to be removed completely. It has to be gone. The Liberals, in their bill, are tinkering with it, adding some exceptions to the rule, but it still exists. It is still their fundamental, primary consideration when it comes to bail.

When I was sitting in bail court, watching proceedings to do research for my bill, I sat there for about 15 hours. Justices of the

peace were quoting the principle of restraint and releasing offenders. Not one person was denied bail for being a repeat violent offender in the time that I watched that court.

My jail not bail act would repeal the principle of restraint, and it would introduce a principle of public safety as the primary consideration. This is where the Liberals did some copying and pasting, and I do admire that. I think sometimes being imitated is a great way to know that one is doing something right.

The bill would introduce something new called a major offences category. This would categorize some of the most extreme violent offences that we have seen in our communities, such as violent shootings, home invasions, violent carjackings, extortion, human trafficking and drug trafficking. Also, when someone attacks a first responder, irrespective of whether they are a police officer, a firefighter or a paramedic, that should be a serious offence requiring a serious look when it comes to bail.

We would make it a reverse onus. We would make sure it is on them to justify to a judge, a justice of peace or a peace officer why they should be released, not the other way around.

Furthermore, we would be tightening the risk assessment standard when it comes to bail. Right now, when it comes to assessing risk, the Liberals look at whether there is a substantial likelihood to reoffend. My bill would lower that threshold to look at reasonable foreseeability. Would a reasonable person believe that this accused person, based on their history and prior bail conditions, would be likely to reoffend? That change would lower the threshold. It would provide objective clarity to the test as well.

The bill would also make it mandatory in the Criminal Code for judges to look at someone's criminal history. We do not see that right now, so it would be codifying that aspect.

It would also make it tougher for repeat violent offenders, going after recidivism. If somebody has been convicted in the last 10 years for one of the major offences, was charged again and was out a third time, and then commits another offence, they should not be getting bail unless a superior court judge looks at their file.

We are also going to be collapsing bail post-sentencing for indictable offences. Bailey McCourt's killer was found guilty. He was guilty in the eyes of the law. He should not have been out on the streets. The next time somebody is found guilty of an indictable offence, they should not be released on bail until someone else looks at it, not just the regular courts.

The bill would make sure we do not have criminals who are vouching for other criminals as sureties. Can members believe that right now in our system, organized criminals can vouch for and be sureties for other criminals? That should not happen. If somebody is guilty of an indictable offence, they would be removed as a possible surety. I personally believe that someone needs to be of good standing or of good character to vouch for someone else, especially someone in their care.

Also, if someone who is not a Canadian citizen or permanent resident but a temporary resident commits an offence and is being charged, they must surrender their passport. We do not want any more flight risks like we saw happen in Edmonton. We will make sure there is annual reporting happening to Parliament. The stats are not there on a national level. We want to make sure there is accountability.

Safe streets should not be a fantasy in a faraway land. We should have them here in Canada. The jail not bail act would lock up repeat violent offenders and restore safe streets in our country once again.

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when people propose amendments to the Criminal Code, they must approach the matter seriously and check that each of the proposed amendments is constitutionally sound. If a bill containing unconstitutional measures passes, it will be struck down in court. This wastes time and resources, and it disheartens Canadians.

On this side of the House, we have introduced Bill C-14, which addresses public safety expectations and complies with the Constitution.

If my Conservative colleague's objective is really to improve safety in our communities, why is he trying to promote a redundant and constitutionally questionable bill, rather than help us move Bill C-14 forward?

[*English*]

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, our jail not bail act is fully constitutionally compliant. These targeted, reasonable, proportionate measures to change the Criminal Code go after a small number of repeat violent offenders. I am strongly confident that our bill is charter-compliant.

Speaking of charter-compliance, on this side of the House, we stand for the charter rights of victims and law-abiding Canadians, unlike what we saw recently with the decision of the Supreme Court, which removed minimum mandatory sentencing for child sexual offences. The government has stayed quiet.

Private Members' Business

On this side of the House, we will invoke the notwithstanding clause to ensure that law-abiding Canadians and children are kept safe.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I understand that a losing a person who was murdered and then seeing the person who committed that crime get parole is a sensitive and emotional issue.

As my colleague knows, and as the facts bear out, a lot of people are currently being detained arbitrarily or while awaiting trial. Our prisons are filled with people awaiting the outcome of their trials. The solution proposed by our colleague could create a space shortage.

The question I want to ask my colleague is this. Has the time come to modernize the process and the various stages of parole? Is it not time to work on that very specific process?

[*English*]

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, I agree. There is time for us to modernize our justice system, but it is important that we modernize our Criminal Code to defend the rights of law-abiding Canadians.

When it comes to our prison capacity, it is important for everyone to understand that this bill targets repeat violent offenders. To share some facts, in Kelowna, the same 15 individuals committed 1,500 crimes in a single year. In Vancouver, the same 40 committed 6,000 crimes in a single year. If we put away these repeat violent offenders, there will be less in and out happening in the criminal justice system.

Our job is to make sure we go after repeat violent offenders. As always, there will be a presumption of innocence, and we will let the courts do their work.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for the work he has done on this bill.

I want to give him another opportunity to talk about something he mentioned in his intervention. He said that it is too late for the victims' loved ones, but they are not fighting for that. They are fighting for next family. They do not want another family to go through what they have gone through.

Perhaps he could share a further story on that.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the stories. We have seen the headlines in the media, the social media posts and the cries for help. The headlines seem like they are from Hollywood movies.

Private Members' Business

Families get destroyed. Sometimes the person who is killed is the only income-earner. Sometimes they are the only person taking care of their kids. It is not only about the stories we want to share, but about the feelings and emotions that come with them. Bailey's family's lives are completely destroyed. They are not in a good spot right now. It is the same with other victims.

For Conservatives, the purpose of sharing these stories is for us to all wake up and know that we are in this chamber to keep Canadians safe. That is one of our top priorities. It is also to make sure the Criminal Code reflects those changes.

I thank all the victims who have courage, take a stand and share their stories. It is with their stories and efforts, when we are all united, that we can make change happen in our country.

● (1425)

Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across Canada our constituents, like mine in Scarborough—Agincourt, are voicing concerns about violent crime, repeat offending and the safety of their communities. These concerns are rooted in real experiences and in a desire to have a justice system that protects the public and upholds the rule of law. That is why I rise today to talk about Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, as part of a broader national conversation about how our bail system should function: how it can best manage risk, promote accountability and maintain confidence in the administration of justice.

Bill C-242, introduced by the hon. member for Oxford, proposes a number of amendments to the Criminal Code and the Department of Justice Act. Among other measures, the bill would expand reverse onus provisions for certain violent offences, restrict release by peace officers for major crimes and modify the standard at bail hearings for assessing risk.

Specifically, Bill C-242 seeks to make public protection a guiding principle in all bail decisions. It would expand the list of offences for which an accused must demonstrate why they should be released, adding a range of serious violent crimes to existing reverse onus provisions. It would also prevent individuals charged with major indictable offences, such as homicide, kidnapping or sexual assault, from being released by a peace officer following arrest.

In addition, the bill proposes that only a superior court judge would be able to determine bail for someone charged with a major offence while already on release for another, reflecting the heightened risks involved in repeat offending. The bill would also prohibit anyone convicted of an indictable offence in the past 10 years from acting as a surety, and it would require non-citizens to surrender their passport as a condition of release.

Finally, it would lower the threshold for assessing risk, changing the standard from a substantial likelihood of reoffending to what is reasonably foreseeable, and it would require explicit consideration of an accused person's criminal history when determining bail.

The bill's proposal to give paramount importance to public safety above other principles of bail deserves close scrutiny, and we are committed to doing that, but we cannot be reactive. We must strike the right balance.

By elevating public safety above all other factors, we risk overlooking cases where the accused does not pose a danger to the community but may present other risks, such as flight risk. In such circumstances, a narrow focus could paradoxically lead to the release of individuals who should remain in custody, while also eroding long-standing principles of bail. Moreover, public safety is already a well-established ground for detention under existing law, so it is unclear what additional value the proposal would actually add to the existing framework.

People in Canada expect their justice system to be firm, fair and focused on safety. They expect that individuals who pose a real threat to others will be dealt with decisively and that victims and communities will be protected. The government shares that commitment. The government has taken and will continue to take strong, targeted action to make Canada's bail system more responsive to the risks posed by repeat violent offenders.

In 2024, Parliament passed reforms that were supported unanimously by provinces and territories. These changes made it more difficult for individuals charged with serious violent offences, particularly those involving firearms or other weapons, to obtain bail. They addressed real concerns with community safety and responded directly to the concerns raised by police services and provincial and territorial leaders across the country.

At the same time, the government knows that supporting first responders is an essential part of ensuring community safety. Police officers, paramedics, firefighters, correctional officers and health care workers face violence and danger as part of their daily work. Through Bill C-3, Parliament took action to protect those who protect us. That legislation amended the Criminal Code to create tougher penalties for assaults against health care workers and first responders. It sent a clear and unequivocal message that violence against the people serving our communities is never acceptable.

● (1430)

Bill C-3 was also part of a broader approach that recognizes the complexity of these challenges. It strengthened the justice system not only through penalties but also through education and awareness, ensuring that our judges, law enforcement officers and service providers have the tools and the understanding they need in order to respond effectively.

However, the government's work did not stop there. Recently the Prime Minister announced that the government would bring forward new legislation to strengthen bail provisions for organized crime-related offences, including auto theft, home invasion and human trafficking. These measures are designed to address the kinds of high-risk, repeat behaviour that most undermine public safety and confidence.

As Parliament continues its study of Bill C-242 and other proposed reforms, it is important that our discussions remain grounded in evidence, guided by collaboration with provinces and territories and focused on the shared goal of keeping Canadians safe.

Public safety and public confidence depend not only on the laws we pass but also on how those laws are implemented, monitored and enforced. That is why the government continues to prioritize data collection, transparency and accountability in the bail system, so we can identify what works, close the gaps and ensure that the system delivers on its promise of protection and fairness.

Law enforcement remains on the front line of this effort. Police services across the country are adapting to increasingly complex cases involving firearms, organized crime and repeat violent behaviour. The federal government continues to work closely with police associations and provincial counterparts to ensure that officers have the legal tools and the operational resources they need in order to keep people in Canada safe. That co-operation is essential because public safety cannot be achieved in isolation; it requires coordination among all levels of government and clear communication among the courts, police and the communities they serve.

We must also recognize that public confidence in the criminal justice system is as much about visibility as it is about outcomes. People in Canada need to see that justice is being done, that bail decisions are informed by fact, that breaches are enforced and that high-risk offenders are monitored closely. Transparency in these processes helps restore trust, and trust is the foundation on which our entire justice system depends.

People in Canada deserve a justice system that reflects both firmness and fairness, one that distinguishes between people who can be safely managed in the community and those who cannot. They deserve to know that when someone poses a serious risk to public safety, the system will respond swiftly, decisively and effectively. That is the approach the government continues to take.

Through legislation such as Bill C-3, recent bail reforms and the Prime Minister's announcement on reforming the bail system, the government is acting to strengthen public safety while upholding the principles of justice that define this country.

Public safety will always be a top priority for the current government. People in Canada expect no less. As we consider proposals for reform, including the ones before us today, we must continue to work together to ensure that our laws remain strong, fair and effective in keeping our communities safe.

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a democracy, there are fundamental principles that dis-

Private Members' Business

tinguish true democratic regimes from states that merely claim to be democratic. The rule of law is based on rules, values and principles that are non-negotiable.

The current mood among certain political parties, thinkers and columnists seems to be more about vengeance in the justice system than true justice. It is sometimes more about seeking likes on social media than creating social peace, showing compassion and being thorough. The current mood criticizes dialogue, moderation and the search for balance. Looking at things in black or white pays off for some. Being nuanced and thoughtful is seen as an expression of weakness in society. I do not subscribe to that ideology. As I often say, I support democracy, justice and the law.

For years, the Conservative Party has been capitalizing on fear and criticism of judicial institutions. Its leader even makes dubious connections and disturbing connotations about the separation of powers. It is therefore no surprise that we are seeing the Conservative Party's desire to inject another dose of populism into our institutions with Bill C-242.

The Bloc Québécois is committed to a number of principles. First and foremost, it believes in the presumption of innocence, the foundation of our justice system, which holds that all people are considered innocent until proven guilty. This principle is clearly set out in our charters, in paragraph 11(d) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and in section 33 of the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, or the Quebec charter. Section 33 states that "Every accused person is presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law."

We must avoid any attempt to do otherwise at all costs. It is crucial that we not revert to a time when mob justice ruled, emotional outbursts held sway and justice was unfettered by clear, impartial and humane rules. Any breach, however small, could set a precedent and allow the risk of seeing our rule of law and justice system left violated and broken.

Democracy and the rule of law are based on a fragile balance between citizens' confidence in their institutions and the weight of popular will and reason. Our democracies are already under attack by harmful ideologies. All we have to do is look around us to see what is happening. Our responsibility as parliamentarians is to maintain this balance between respect for rights, confidence in institutions and public opinion. To do that, we need to be clear, we need to educate and we need to listen, not play petty populist games or use baseball analogies to talk about a subject as important as the law, justice and public safety. Our Conservative colleagues can keep repeating "three-strikes law" all they want, but it does not make this issue any less complex.

Private Members' Business

I would say to my colleagues in the official opposition that if they want clear and concrete proposals for fighting crime, they can adopt the Bloc Québécois's proposals. We propose creating a registry of criminal organizations, like the registry for terrorist organizations. This would make it easier to prove when a crime is committed for the benefit of a criminal organization. We also propose facilitating the seizure of assets by reversing the burden of proof to prevent the dissipation of assets when an individual belonging to organized crime is arrested. We also propose prohibiting criminal organizations from parading their insignia. Currently, criminal organizations parade with impunity and promote their organization. Finally, we propose creating a specific offence to criminalize the recruitment of young people to commit crimes. This new tactic has become the modus operandi of organized crime. It ruins lives and families. We must crack down harder on those who abuse our young people.

• (1440)

Understandably, the Bloc Québécois will vote against the Conservative Party's populist bill. We will always choose being constructive and democratic over being populists. Our commitment to democracy has always been at the heart of our national project. We will always be committed to the independence of our institutions.

[English]

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals formed government in 2015, this country has had a steady and alarming increase in major crime. Violent crime is up 55%, homicides are up 29%, sex assaults are up 76%, firearms offences are up 131% and extortion is up a whopping 330%. The government's tireless efforts to prioritize the rights and freedoms of the accused at the express expense of victim and community safety is the problem.

In 2019, the Liberal government initiated bail reform in this country by amending the Criminal Code to introduce the principle of restraint, which immediately instructed judges and justices of the peace to prioritize the release of the accused at the earliest opportunity and under the least restrictive conditions. Contrary to a false Liberal narrative, neither the Supreme Court decision in the Antic case nor its decision in the Zora case instructed the federal government to amend the Criminal Code to add the principle of restraint.

From the perspective of a former Crown attorney, the amendment meant that regardless of the nature of the charge committed by the accused and its impact on the community or victim; regardless of the accused's criminal record, which could show a pattern of breaching court orders or being found guilty of the same offence; and, most important, regardless of the number of prior bail orders the accused may already have been subjected to, the government instructed judges and justices to release the accused.

This was the origin of catch-and-release, which we now have in this country, where repeat violent criminals circulate through the justice system with regularity, offering up false promises of bail compliance.

In 2022, the government weakened the criminal justice system again and exposed Canadians to immense risks with the passage of Bill C-5. Notwithstanding the long-established position of the Supreme Court that mandatory minimum penalties do not necessar-

ily violate the charter, the Liberal government repealed mandatory minimums for serious gun crimes and violent crimes and expanded house arrest for all drug offences and serious violent crimes.

In 2023, after hearing from numerous stakeholders regarding the stolen vehicle crisis, the Liberal government brought in Bill C-48, its second attempt at bail reform. A core feature of the bill was to introduce a number of new reverse onus provisions to gun offences and other serious violent offences. The key messaging was that this meant that violent repeat offenders would be detained and that the bill would contribute to the safety of Canadians. The opposite happened; the rising crime state clearly establishes that the bill failed miserably in achieving its goals.

Over the course of the last four-plus years, we have heard from premiers of all provinces and territories, police chiefs, presidents of police associations, mayors from across the country, and several victim advocacy groups, pleading for the government to exercise its number one priority: to keep Canadians safe and to implement immediate bail reform.

What was the response? David Lametti, the former minister of justice, proudly proclaimed that he did deliver bail reform. He was completely oblivious to the crime and chaos happening all around him. Lametti was later fired, and the government appointed Arif Virani. His first comments after his swearing-in were to remind Canadians that it was all in their heads that Canada is less safe. He too reminded Canadians that he delivered bail reform, through the passage of Bill C-48.

In the 45th Parliament, we have heard from the public safety minister that our Canadian bail system is sound and is working as it should. Later we heard from our justice minister, who blamed the provinces for the bail problems we have, and he said that Canada is not the Wild West. That was on the very same weekend when there were violent home invasions that led to the deaths of homeowners.

Canadians and our stakeholders could not wait any longer. A recent Abacus poll conducted this past September showed that 79% of Canadians felt that it is too easy for serious offenders to get bail. That is precisely why my colleague from Oxford introduced the jail not bail act. I would like to take this opportunity to point out, notwithstanding the false narrative from the Liberals, that law enforcement unconditionally endorsed the bill as offering the best opportunity to rebalance the bail system to prioritize community safety over the release of repeat violent offenders.

What would the bill do? The principal feature would be to repeal the principle of restraint and replace it with the principle of public and community safety. The practical effect would be to end the default to release culture, which has created the bail crisis we have in this country. The priority is the safety of communities and victims, not the release of repeat violent offenders. This is a marked distinguishing feature of Bill C-14, which would still preserve, to various degrees, the principle of restraint.

● (1445)

The bill also creates a list of major offences that would trigger a presumption of detention, regardless of whether it would be a reverse onus charge. For major offences, peace officer release is unavailable.

The bill expands reverse onus to several violent offences, including firearms, sexual offences, kidnapping/trafficking, home invasion, break and enter, robbery, extortion and arson offences.

The bill adds surety and non-resident safeguards, which are completely absent in Bill C-14. It bars naming as surety anyone convicted of an indictable offence within 10 years. It also requires consideration of non-residency and flight risk, and it mandates passport denial for non-residents upon release.

Another significant feature of the jail not bail act is an adjustment to the risk threshold analysis under the secondary grounds for detention under section 515 of the Criminal Code. The current test is whether detention is necessary for the protection and safety of the public, including victims or witnesses, or to prevent the commission of a further criminal offence based on the substantial likelihood of such an event occurring. “Substantial likelihood” has been defined in case law as a real and significant probability of a particular outcome occurring. This was never viewed as an onerous test from Crown counsel; they often asked the justice to consider the criminal record of the accused and to look for patterns of conviction either for the same offence or a conviction for breaching a court order, such as bail, probation and conditional sentences.

The jail not bail act lowers that secondary ground threshold from “substantial likelihood” to “reasonable foreseeability” in assessing risk of reoffending or interference with justice.

We have all heard about the tragic yet preventable murder of Bailey McCourt, a young Kelowna mother who was bludgeoned to death by her ex-husband with a hammer in broad daylight. She was murdered the very same day, and within a few hours, of his being convicted of assault and uttering threats. He was released on bail pending sentencing, with the obvious condition that he not have contact with Bailey.

Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, provides for the expiry of the interim release of an accused upon their conviction of an indictable offence while they await sentencing. The finding of guilt by a justice expunges the presumption of innocence as guaranteed by the charter. This provision in the jail not bail act is simply common sense.

This country has long awaited real immediate bail reform. The Liberal government created the mess we find ourselves in. Do we now really expect it to provide the solution when it had the last 10

Private Members' Business

years to reverse course on its hug-a-thug mentality to exercising its number one priority, which is the safety of all Canadians? Law enforcement across this country has hailed the jail not bail act as the common-sense solution to keeping communities and victims safe while ensuring repeat violent criminals are kept in jail where they belong.

I urge all parliamentarians to set aside their political ideology and make it their priority to pass Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. As I have said numerous times inside and outside the House, and in town halls right across this country from coast to coast to coast, community and victim safety ought not to be a partisan exercise. Let us get this passed.

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, improving safety in our communities is a mainstay of our Liberal platform.

Six months into the new government's mandate, we have clearly backed up our commitments with a series of concrete actions, as the budget tabled earlier this week shows.

During the election campaign, we promised Canadians that this new government would make bail reform and tougher sentences a priority. That is exactly what we are doing with Bill C-14, for example.

On this side of the House, our approach is responsible and constructive. We ensure that proposed amendments to the Criminal Code are constitutional. Otherwise, if the bill passes, the courts would strike it down. This wastes time and resources, and leaves Canadians disheartened. That is not something we want.

Looking at Bill C-242, one really has to wonder whether our colleagues in the official opposition have really taken the time to analyze it from a constitutional perspective. If my colleagues' goal is truly to make communities safer, I wonder why they are promoting a redundant bill that creates confusion and poses constitutional risks, rather than working to implement Bill C-14.

Private Members' Business

I will take the next few minutes to explain why Bill C-14 is a step in the right direction to make our communities safer, as we committed to do during the election campaign. Bill C-14 proposes a comprehensive reform of Canada's bail and sentencing systems, with more than 80 targeted amendments. This is a major undertaking that will meet the public's expectations. It includes amendments to the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the National Defence Act.

With regard to strengthening the bail system, Bill C-14 will create new reverse onus provisions for serious and violent crimes. This means that bail will no longer be the norm for these types of crime. The accused would be detained by default, and would then have to prove why they should be released on bail. This applies to crimes that are plaguing our society. I am thinking in particular of organized auto theft. In recent years, people going on vacation are finding that their vehicles have been stolen from the airport. People should not have to worry about whether or not they will find their vehicle when they return home. We are therefore going to make bail harder for people who engage in organized auto theft.

We are going to crack down on home invasions. People should feel safe in their own homes. It will be more difficult for those who attack people in their own homes to get bail. The same is true for people who engage in human trafficking and smuggling. People who exploit vulnerable individuals should have a harder time getting bail, and that is what we are doing with Bill C-14. This bill also addresses crimes such as violent assault, sexual assault and extortion involving violence. It will be more difficult for those who commit such crimes to get bail in Canada. I believe that this is what Canadians expect of us.

We are also going to ask the courts to take into account allegations of random or unprovoked violence. Let us say that someone attacks me when all I was doing was walking down the street, minding my own business. That will be an aggravating factor that must be considered when determining whether the person should be kept in custody while awaiting trial. It is the same thing if the accused has a history of intimate partner or other violence.

We will also change the conditions of release. For people charged with offences related to auto theft, burglary, extortion, and organized crime, courts will have to consider imposing stricter conditions, such as curfews, geographic restrictions, and no-contact orders. For those charged with extortion or organized crime, the same will apply, and there will be prohibitions on possessing a weapon.

When a court assesses the grounds for keeping a person in custody pending trial, there are three main factors to consider. First, it is essential to make sure the person will appear in court. Is the person a flight risk? Second, the protection of the public must be ensured. If the person is released, does this pose a risk to public safety? Finally, public confidence in the administration of justice must be maintained. This last reason is very important. That is why, with Bill C-14, we are introducing an amendment to require courts to take into account the number and seriousness of pending charges.

• (1455)

This means that if a person appears in court for a crime and has several other pending charges, those charges could play a role in

the decision to take the person into custody or not, in order to maintain public trust in the administration of justice.

Bill C-14 also provides stiffer sentences for different serious and violent crimes. We need to ensure that the sentences imposed are proportional to the severity of violent offences committed by repeat offenders. During the election campaign, people asked us to review these sentences, and that is what we are doing through Bill C-14, because stronger deterrence through sentences that fit the crime is important.

New aggravating factors are going to be added, which ultimately means harsher sentences. This includes offences against first responders in the performance of their duties. Examples include police officers or firefighters, who put their safety at risk every day to protect us. These people deserve protection. If crimes like assault are committed against our first responders, the perpetrator will face harsher prison sentences.

Earlier this week, I attended a cocktail party hosted by the International Association of Fire Fighters, and I had the opportunity to speak with a number of firefighters from across the country. Many of them told me they were very pleased to see this measure included in Bill C-14. They said that it was a step in the right direction and that it made them feel included in our deliberations. It is very important to ensure that our first responders are protected.

If the accused is a repeat violent offender who has previously been convicted of a violent offence in the last five years, this will also be an aggravating factor. If someone is serving a sentence, gets out of prison and commits another violent crime, they will have to go back behind bars. It just makes sense.

Organized retail theft in businesses and stores is now recognized as an aggravating factor. Small business owners and their staff get up every morning and work hard to earn a living. These people deserve to be protected. They do not deserve to be robbed. By better protecting them, we are sending them a message that we recognize how important they are to our country and our economy. If people commit crimes in their businesses, whether it is shoplifting or offences related to organized crime, they will be punished more severely.

It is the same thing for offences that interfere with essential infrastructure, especially copper theft. When a person steals copper from transmission lines or towers, it interferes with essential infrastructure. Let me give an example. Last summer, in Restigouche, in my riding, someone stole copper, which caused several cell towers to stop working. A large area was left with no cell coverage. Had there been an emergency, the public could have been in danger. That is why we need to crack down on this type of crime.

We will also increase penalties for certain crimes. For example, house arrest will no longer be an option for those who are found guilty of aggravated sexual assault or child sexual abuse. These individuals will have to serve a prison sentence. I think that Canadians expect such crimes to be severely punished. This is a measure that I unequivocally support, and it is included in Bill C-14.

Bill C-14 is part of a comprehensive approach to fighting crime put forward by our government. Our approach also includes Bill C-12, which will strengthen security at our borders, and Bill C-9, which will strengthen the fight against hate crimes. In addition, we have made commitments that will very soon result in legislative changes to better protect victims of intimate partner violence. There is our anti-fraud strategy, which aims to better protect our seniors from financial crimes. There are also the investments announced in the budget, plus those dedicated to crime prevention. We want to crack down on serious crimes, but we also want to prevent them. That is why we are investing in housing, mental health and youth support to strengthen crime prevention.

Bill C-14 and all the other measures we are putting in place show that our new Liberal government takes the fight against crime very seriously. Sometimes I get the impression that my colleagues across the floor see politics as theatre. They propose ideological measures such as Bill C-242, which would probably not even pass constitutional muster. On this side, we know that community safety is not about theatrics, it is not a matter of political gamesmanship. It is a serious issue that deserves concrete and constitutional measures such as Bill C-14.

• (1500)

I think this is an excellent bill, particularly because we listened to the public, the provinces and the territories. I invite all of my colleagues to work collaboratively on adopting the Liberals' Bill C-14 instead of continuing to promote a bill like Bill C-242.

[*English*]

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the great people of Abbotsford—South Langley, whom I have the honour to represent in this House.

Private Members' Business

I want to recognize the important week we have coming up as we approach Remembrance Day. I want to take a moment to reflect on the significance of this time and why the simple act of wearing a poppy holds so much true meaning.

The poppy has become a symbol of remembrance for the men and women who served our country so proudly and continue to serve in our armed forces. These heroes laid down their lives so we could have the ability to call Canada home, a place we are so proud of and have the honour to live in. Canada's freedom, democracy and the values we preserve are the result of their courage, sacrifices and unwavering commitment to our nation.

Wearing a poppy is more than just a tradition; it is a pledge of gratitude. It is our way of honouring the courage, resilience and dedication of our veterans and our members in active service. I encourage everyone to wear a poppy with pride to reflect on the sacrifices made for our country and to express the most profound thanks to all who have served and are currently serving in the Canadian Armed Forces.

We are speaking about such an important topic today. I made a statement earlier about an individual who was shot down in my community of Abbotsford. Bail reform and justice need to be brought to our country. It is why the Conservative Party put the jail not bail bill forward in this House. We are prioritizing our country and our nation.

We need change. People have dealt with this for long enough. They are suffering. There are people in our communities who are asking us questions, like why there is no justice and why justice is not being presented to the families that have lost loved ones.

It breaks my heart when family members cry in front of us and say that their loved one had done nothing. An eight-year-old boy from Toronto was shot while sleeping in his bed. What did he do to deserve such an act? This is why the bill is very important, and I look forward to continuing to speak to this matter.

[*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.

It being 3:03 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, November 17, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 3:03 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, November 7, 2025

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget

Financial Statement of Minister of Finance

Motion	3599
Anderson	3599
Lamoureux	3600
Ruff	3601
Eyolfson	3601
DeBellefeuille	3601
Ross	3601
Deschênes-Thériault	3602
DeBellefeuille	3603
Doherty	3603
Johns	3603
Lalonde	3603
Gill (Windsor West)	3605
Duclos	3605
Doherty	3605
DeBellefeuille	3605
Sudds	3605
Dalton	3607
Deschênes	3607

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Build Communities Strong Fund

Klassen	3607
---------------	------

Darshan Singh Sahsi

Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	3608
---------------------------------------	------

Infrastructure Investments

Dhaliwal	3608
----------------	------

Addiction Services

Kronis	3608
--------------	------

Francophone Immigration

Fortier	3608
---------------	------

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Anderson	3608
----------------	------

Chester W. Ruttle

Schiefke	3609
----------------	------

Bone Marrow Donors

Scheer	3609
--------------	------

Social Economy Month

DeBellefeuille	3609
----------------------	------

Craft Brewers

McKinnon	3609
----------------	------

The Budget

Brock	3610
-------------	------

November

Sawatzky	3610
----------------	------

The Budget

Epp	3610
-----------	------

Veterans' Week

Iacono	3610
--------------	------

The Budget

Holman	3610
--------------	------

Sleep in Heavenly Peace

Petitpas Taylor	3611
-----------------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy

Khanna	3611
MacKinnon	3611
Khanna	3611
Champagne	3611
Seeback	3611
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3611
Seeback	3612
Solomon	3612

Finance

Deltell	3612
Lightbound	3612
Deltell	3612
Provost	3612

The Budget

Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3612
MacKinnon	3612
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3612
Joly	3613
Perron	3613
Lightbound	3613

Finance

Genuis	3613
Church	3613
Genuis	3613
Church	3613
Lake	3613
Hodgson	3614
Lake	3614
McGuinty	3614

The Economy

DeRidder	3614
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	3614
Scheer	3614
Hajdu	3614

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget

Financial Statement of Minister of Finance

Motion	3623
DeBellefeuille	3623
Deschênes-Thériault	3624
Ruff	3625
Perron	3625
Perron	3625
Leitão	3627
Deschênes-Thériault	3627
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3627
Lavoie	3628
Mantle	3629
Deschênes-Thériault	3629
Johns	3629
Lamoureux	3630

Dzerowicz	3630
Amendment negatived	3632

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Jail Not Bail Act

Khanna	3632
Bill C-242, Second reading	3632
Deschênes-Thériault	3635
DeBellefeuille	3635
Doherty	3635
Yip	3636
Gaudreau	3637
Brock	3638
Deschênes-Thériault	3639
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	3641

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>