



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 056
Wednesday, November 19, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 19, 2025

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION PILOT PROGRAM

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after decades of advocacy, caregivers' dream of landed status on arrival finally came with the Canada's home care worker immigration pilot. However, the pilot never opened for intake, and it has been closed without any explanation. This is a betrayal to the people who fought so hard for respect and fairness.

Meanwhile, the PR processing backlog for caregivers already in Canada stands at over 34,000 cases. Instead of expediting the processing, the allotted PR quota for all economic pilot programs, including caregivers, under the new levels plan is being reduced. It will take over seven years to process the backlog. This means that tens of thousands of caregivers already in Canada, caring for our children and elders, doing this essential and often undervalued work are left in limbo.

Caregivers should not be treated as second class or a footnote in Canada's immigration policy. The Liberals must expand the allocation for caregivers, clear the backlog and give those workers the dignity they deserve.

* * *

[*Translation*]

A NOVEL BY KAMAL BENKIRANE

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a novel that touches our hearts as much as it makes us think: *L'ombre de tes lumières*, by the author Kamal Benkirane.

Using a simple yet deeply stirring writing style, Benkirane leads us into a story about love, resilience and a search for identity. He talks about families, communities, the often-fragile ties that unite us and the strength it takes to protect those ties.

He encourages us to build bridges between generations and to listen to our histories while also looking to the future. He reminds us that dignity comes from the voice of dialogue and from the courage to build a truly inclusive society.

In a Canada that is proud of its diversity but aware of the miles still to go, *L'ombre de tes lumières* is more than just a literary work. It is a call to better understand one another, to welcome others and to celebrate what emerges when shadow meets light.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN WESTERN AGRIBITION

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from November 24 to 29, the country comes to town as Regina hosts the 54th annual Canadian Western Agribition. People come out and enjoy great food, the largest livestock show in Canada, four nights of electrifying rodeo, the trade fair and the best beef show on the continent. Whatever one fancies, Agribition has something for everyone. Agribition is about community. Our western way of life is the ultimate spot to be next week.

This show holds a special place in my heart. Our family's winter vacation was showing our dairy cattle at Agribition. I am happy I can take my kids through the same barns and tell them stories about cattle shows and the life lessons learned on the farm. I can even let them help out in the wash rack with some animals every now and then.

I ask everyone to mark their calendars and come out to the Canadian Western Agribition, where they can grab some food, ride the mechanical bull and see who is crowned supreme champion at this year's beef show.

With participants from around the globe, it is where the world meets. From the Riders' big win last week to Agribition this week, Saskatchewan just keeps winning.

*Statements by Members***DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH**

Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November is Diabetes Awareness Month. It is a time to reflect on the millions of Canadians who are living with diabetes.

Last week, I hosted my fifth annual diabetes flag-raising at Brampton City Hall.

I also represented Canada at the PDGN Global Parliamentary Advocacy Forum on diabetes, showcasing Canada's leadership in diabetes in global health.

Universal access to diabetes care is very important. Progress was made after the passing of my private member's bill to establish the national framework for diabetes in 2021. However, there is more to do. We need to ensure that all provinces and territories join the national pharmacare plan to make essential diabetes medication free. Together, let us continue working hard to extinguish the flame burning outside Sir Frederick Banting's Banting House and achieve a world free of diabetes.

* * *

[*Translation*]**RON BRADLEY**

Jim Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to Ron Bradley, a remarkable man who dedicated his life to serving his community. He served in several capacities, including as deputy mayor of Rayside-Balfour, a proud member of the Knights of Columbus and a member of the St-Joseph parish council.

[*English*]

Ron was politically active. He served on many boards, including those of the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, Sudbury's regional planning board and the Nickel District Conservation Authority.

Ron Bradley was a founding member of the United Steelworkers Local 6500 and ended his mining career as a shift boss at Inco.

He will be remembered across the riding for his selfless service and devotion to family and community.

On behalf of all constituents, I extend heartfelt condolences to his family and friends.

* * *

[*Translation*]**WORLD WAR I**

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recently went to visit the commemorative plaque at the Saint-Charles-de-Limoilou church, which was placed in memory of the soldiers from our community who fell in the First World War.

These men, who were our neighbours, our family members, our schoolmates, left Limoilou to go and fight for freedom thousands of kilometres from home. Their courage, their sense of duty, and their faith in a better future continue to be a source of profound inspiration for us all.

This plaque, etched in bronze and in the memory of our community, reminds us that behind each name is a story, a dream interrupted, a family forever changed. Whenever we view it and reflect upon it, we not only remember; we renew an important link between the past and the present.

May we continue to keep their memory alive from generation to generation, and build a world worthy of their sacrifice.

* * *

ANNIVERSARY WISHES

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to mark the 110th anniversary of the Cercle de fermières de Plessisville.

It was on November 27, 1915, that Marie-Ange Vallée and some of the village women founded one of the very first farm women's circles in Quebec. This group became one of the founding members of what is now a large family of 34,000 farm women across the province, a group that is also celebrating 110 years of history.

For more than a century, these women have passionately and generously shared their knowledge of traditional textile arts such as weaving, knitting, crochet, quilting, lacemaking, and many other skills that make up our rich heritage. Without farm women, a significant part of our history and our knowledge would no longer exist. With close to 125 members still active in 2025, the Cercle de fermières de Plessisville stands as a key pillar of our community.

To all the farm women of yesterday, today and tomorrow, from Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière and all across Quebec: Thank you for your dedication, your creativity, and your invaluable contribution to Quebec's heritage.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]**REMEMBRANCE DAY LEADERS**

Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect on last week's ceremonies of remembrance. November 11 is always special at the Royal Canadian Legion on Hamilton Mountain, in part because of the valiant leadership of Jean Tomlinson, but particularly because of the Reverend Chisholm. Rev. Dr. Francis Chisholm, a World War II vet, padre since 1964, is still captivating at 99 years old; the junior Rev. Chisholm, his daughter, is another inspiring leader.

Last week was also the 75th anniversary of the Korean War. An event was hosted by Hamilton Mountain's HooJung Jones, the most ardent advocate for the 1950s conflict we have in this country. That conflict saw 26,000 Canadians go to war, and 516 of them did not come home.

Because of the champions in our community, we will never forget.

*Statements by Members***AFFORDABILITY**

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, eight months ago, on the steps of Rideau Hall, the Prime Minister pledged to focus on what matters to Canadians: affordability. He pledged that ultimately he would be judged not by his promises but by the prices Canadians face every single day. However, under his watch, life has only become more expensive. Inflation is still running at 3.4%, and food prices have risen nearly 40% faster here than in the United States.

Ironically, the Prime Minister cannot even fault Justin Trudeau for today's mess, because he was the principal adviser for that government as well. The budget was the Prime Minister's chance to finally deliver relief. Instead of responsible fiscal planning, we have creative accounting that piles on staggering intergenerational debt with no credible path to balance.

This budget was built on hubris, not humility, and Conservatives will continue to fight every step of the way to continue to build confidence and bring forward policies that will deliver a future Canadians can actually afford.

* * *

[Translation]

RÉMI QUIRION

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the illustrious career of Quebec's chief scientist, Rémi Quirion, who will be retiring in the spring.

He was appointed in 2011 when this role was initially created. As Quebec's first chief scientist, he laid the foundations for the role, defined its areas of focus and built its credibility both in Quebec and abroad. Thanks to his vision and his gift for bringing people together, he has forged lasting bonds between the areas of research, education, innovation and public policy. While serving successive ministers and governments over the years, he has remained true to the fundamental principle of decision-making based on science, fact and the search for truth.

We wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement. May his legacy inspire future generations, and may our public policy remain grounded in the values he cherished: rigour, curiosity and scientific integrity.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I extend my thanks to Rémi Quirion for all he has done.

* * *

CRAQUE-BITUME

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to highlight the outstanding work of Craque-Bitume, an urban ecology collective that, for the past 14 years, has helped Quebec City residents embrace an eco-conscious lifestyle. Craque-Bitume is known for its urban and community garden initiatives, its environmental education workshops, and its impressive community composting network that now boasts 34 sites, 18 of which are located in the beautiful riding of Québec Centre.

I would like to recognize the commitment of the organization's many volunteers, including Ms. De Haan, who so passionately supports Craque-Bitume's work. My congratulations to Craque-Bitume and all its partners for their leadership and their collaboration. They are making the people of Québec Centre so proud.

* * *

● (1415)

[English]

THE BUDGET

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are facing another costly Liberal budget that will keep the cost of essentials like food and fuel high and eat away at the hard-earned savings of the people of Red Deer. Seniors on fixed incomes tell me they can barely eat, and young people say it is impossible to get ahead and start a family. Canadians cannot take more careless Liberal spending while jobs are lost and the Prime Minister jet-sets around the world with nothing to show for it.

Fitch Ratings says that since the Liberal government blows through its fiscal anchors, “federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration”. If the credit agency's scoring of the government was not bad enough, the non-partisan Parliamentary Budget Officer says, “With Budget 2025 the Government abandoned the previous fiscal anchor to reduce the federal debt-to-GDP ratio over the medium term...noting that ‘[t]his metric is key not only for fiscal sustainability,’”.

It is no wonder the Prime Minister—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Whitby.

* * *

PETER PERRY AWARD WINNER

Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate Leo Plue, Whitby's 2025 Peter Perry Award recipient. This is the highest distinction in our town, recognizing true dedication to community building.

For over 40 years, Leo has created opportunities in the classroom, inspiring thousands of students and driving change in Ontario's high schools through e-learning, but his vision reaches far beyond the classroom. Leo brought the Abilities Centre, a national beacon for inclusive spaces, to life, and helped secure Whitby's critical care hospital. Once complete, it will provide essential health care for families across Durham Region. He also supports children with complex needs as the chair of Grandview Kids and as a board member of Sloane's House.

Leo shows that leadership is not about titles; it is about changing lives. I congratulate Leo. He makes us all proud and he makes Canada stronger.

*Statements by Members***POWELL RIVER HYDRO DAMS**

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Powell River, one of the local communities I represent, two hydro dams provided a clean, reliable and cost-effective source of electricity for over 100 years. Their electricity powered the local pulp mill, created thousands of jobs and quite literally built this amazing and beautiful city. That was until the mill fell into financial trouble and was forced to sell the dams as distressed assets to Brookfield, the company that registers its subsidiaries in Bermuda and has avoided paying more than \$6 billion in Canadian taxes.

Now we have found out it wants to use these amazing assets not to create Canadian jobs nor to power Canadian homes, but to export all of the electricity to the United States, with no benefit to the people of Powell River, B.C. or Canada. However, to export this power, it needs a permit from the federal government. That is why I am imploring it today, as the local elected representative, to deny this application.

Let us get back to putting the interests of Canada and the Canadian people first, instead of foreign-owned corporations.

* * *

UYGHUR REFUGEES

Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in February 2023, this House voted unanimously to welcome and resettle 10,000 deeply vulnerable Uyghurs. That vote was a historic moment for this Parliament and for the Uyghur people.

According to the United Nations, the Uyghur people are still subject to grave and serious crimes against humanity. We must say this. We must acknowledge it. We must recognize it.

Thankfully, a few deeply vulnerable Uyghur people have arrived in Canada. The refugees I have met are deeply grateful to Canada and Canadians. They have told me that for the first time, they know what safety and security are. Some of those Uyghur refugees are here on the Hill today. We will be holding a reception, and I ask all parliamentarians to attend.

I ask the Uyghur people listening to remain steadfast and resilient, and to continue speaking up and sharing what is happening to their people.

I thank the MPs who have supported this just cause.

* * *

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is called the House of Commons for a reason. It was created to serve the common people, not jet-setting elites, yet the Prime Minister did not get the memo. How else do we explain a leader who spends more time in the air than in this chamber? He even puts Justin Trudeau to shame.

In 2022, the then prime minister flew just over 127,000 kilometres in 10 months, or roughly three times around the earth. The Prime Minister, in just eight months, had 28 trips totalling 153,000 kilometres, which is enough to circle the globe nearly four times. That is almost an entire month away from Canadians.

What do we have to show for it? No softwood lumber—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1420)

The Speaker: Excuse me. The S.O. 31s are not meant to be heckled.

The hon. member can begin from the top.

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, this is called the House of Commons for a reason. It was created to serve the common people, not jet-setting elites, yet the Prime Minister did not get the memo. How else do we explain a leader who spends more time in the air than in this chamber? He even puts Justin Trudeau to shame.

In 2022, Prime Minister Trudeau flew over 127,000 kilometres in 10 months, or roughly three times around the earth. The current Prime Minister, in just eight months, had 28 trips totalling 153,000 kilometres, which is enough to circle the globe nearly four times. That is almost a whole month away from Canadians.

What do we have to show for it? There is no softwood lumber deal, no relief for steel, autos or aluminum and no progress on Chinese tariffs for canola or our seafood harvesters. Even India slapped new duties on us. There have been nothing but photo ops, fancy meetings and hollow letters of intent. Every time it is wheels up, Canadians are left with higher costs and no results.

This is the House of Commons, where leaders should be accountable. Canadians deserve a Prime Minister who delivers, not one who simply racks up the air miles.

* * *

HOLODOMOR

Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 92nd anniversary of the famine genocide in Ukraine known as the Holodomor, when Joseph Stalin closed Ukraine's borders and confiscated all food to destroy a Ukrainian population opposed to his rule. At the height of the Holodomor, 19 people per minute, 1,200 per hour and 28,000 per day were dying of famine. The world was silent, and millions died as a result.

My grandmother Olena was a survivor of the Holodomor. She once told me that she hoped the victims of the Holodomor would not only be remembered, but be honoured. She said honouring them meant not just remembering them or commemorating them, but taking the steps to ensure that a crime like this never happens again.

Right now, in Russian-occupied Ukraine, it is happening again. Russia is killing civilians, deporting children and much more. The only way to stop this is for the world to provide Ukraine with the support it needs so that it can liberate all of its people and decisively win the war.

If we do this, we will truly do what my grandmother would ask us to if she were here today: remember the victims, commemorate the victims and honour the victims.

Vichna yim pamyat. Slava Ukraini.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are paying the price for this Prime Minister through record-high grocery and housing prices, but he wants them to pay even more. He has doubled Justin Trudeau's deficit, the biggest deficit in Canadian history outside of the pandemic years. It is \$16 billion bigger than he promised during the election campaign.

Why? It is to fund a bureaucracy that has grown by 80% since the Liberals took office. Now, the government House leader is saying that there will be only minimal reductions in the bureaucracy.

Why must Canadians pay to feed the bureaucracy, rather than feeding their families?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has not read the budget. If he had, perhaps he would have seen what is happening right now. We are reducing the government's operating expenses. If he did not see that, perhaps that is why he voted against the budget, or perhaps he is just acting in bad faith.

He is against the jobs that we are trying to create across the country, against investments in defence, against investments in health care, and against investments in mining, electricity and energy projects across the country. Basically, he is against growth.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is beginning another photo op tour. It is time to start asking for the results of his more than 20 international trips, covering 150,000 kilometres, enough to circle the globe four times.

What happened during all those meetings? U.S. tariffs have doubled. India has imposed tariffs on our peas. China has imposed tar-

iffs on the products of our farmers and fishers. It would be better for our economy if the Prime Minister hid under a rock instead of attending another meeting.

Can the minister give us even one example of a tariff that the Prime Minister has succeeded in reducing?

• (1425)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only person hiding under a rock right now is the Leader of the Opposition when he looks at his caucus.

I think the Leader of the Opposition wants to make sure that the Canadian economy remains dependent on the U.S. economy. I think that is his strategy and he is not being up front about it with Canadians.

On our side of the House, the strategy is to diversify our markets and create jobs, including by going to the United Arab Emirates, the Gulf countries, Europe and Asia. In fact, the Swedes are in town. That is good news. We are doing good business.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are paying the price for the Prime Minister through record-high grocery and housing cost inflation, but he wants them to pay even more. He has doubled Justin Trudeau's deficit. It is the biggest deficit in Canadian history outside of COVID and \$16 billion bigger than he promised. He shattered his other promise to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio.

The bureaucracy is taking the lion's share, which is 80% more costly than when the Liberals took office. The Liberal House leader said just yesterday there will be only minimal reductions in the bureaucracy. Why must starving Canadians pay to feed the bureaucracy, rather than to feed their families?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, do members know what helps families? Good-paying jobs do. That is why we have had such a tremendous response to this budget, including from Canada's Building Trades Unions, which has said it is grateful to all parliamentarians who supported the federal budget and acted in the best interests of Canadians.

I guess that does not include the Conservatives, who voted against the very Canadians they say they stand up for.

*Oral Questions***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is beginning another costly photo op tour. It is time to start asking for the results of the more than 20 international trips and the 150,000 kilometres, which are enough to circle the globe four times. It would be great if he were actually getting something done.

When he met with the Americans, they doubled tariffs on our products. He met with the Chinese and they hit us with new tariffs on our farmers and fish harvesters. He met with the Indians and they hit us with new tariffs on Canadian peas. The British are still blocking our beef.

Can the Prime Minister give us even one example of a tariff his international meetings have succeeded in reducing?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has been in this House for more than 20 years with not much to show for it.

Here is what we have accomplished in the last few months in trade. We have signed new trade deals with Ecuador and Indonesia. We are advancing trade discussions with ASEAN, the Philippines and Thailand, and we are wrapping up—

The Speaker: Again, it was a bit too noisy.

Could the hon. minister continue, please?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, we have signed new trade deals with Ecuador and Indonesia. We are advancing trade negotiations with ASEAN, the Philippines and Thailand and are wrapping up a FIPA with the U.A.E. We have legislation before the House to expand our trade ties with the U.K. Together these countries represent 750 million potential consumers. While the Prime Minister is opening doors for workers and businesses, the other side is focused on shutting them.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all that adds up to not a single tariff reduced in the Prime Minister's eight months of travelling the globe.

Now let us move on to his costly agenda on pipelines. In June 2014, the Conservative government approved a pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific. On November 29, 2016, the Liberal government cancelled that pipeline, ordering the energy board to dismiss it. On March 27, 2021, the current Liberal Prime Minister said that he supported cancelling the pipeline.

Will the Prime Minister admit he was wrong, that his Liberal government was wrong and that Conservatives were right? We need a pipe to the Pacific now.

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the premier have publicly stated that they are having productive discussions on advancing an MOU between Canada and Alberta. They have each stated that those discussions are premised on building a pathways decarbonization project, strengthening the industrial carbon price and receiving support from affected first nations jurisdictions.

When the Prime Minister and the premier are ready to make an announcement, they will, to all Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are hoping the Prime Minister will announce he was wrong and that the Liberal government was wrong to kill the northern gateway pipeline that had been approved back in 2014. Nine years have since been lost after the Liberal government blocked it. However, it also put in a ban on shipping Canadian energy off the northwest coast of B.C., so if there is a pipeline while the Liberal ban remains in place, it would have to be a pipeline to nowhere.

Will the Prime Minister admit the Liberal government was wrong to ban Canadian energy shipping, and will he scrap the ban so we can pipe our product over to Asia?

• (1430)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in those long, barren Harper years when the member was a minister, the only pipeline that was built was the pipeline full of hot air that led to nothing. Not a single energy-exporting piece of tidewater infrastructure was ever constructed under a Conservative government. We have built one. We just heard the minister talking about a process on another.

If someone wants to vote for energy security, vote for energy exports or vote for major projects and opportunity in this country, they should cast a Liberal vote.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture announced \$500 million a year for arts and culture in the budget. However, he could have announced \$1.5 billion at no cost to taxpayers—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

I am going to ask the hon. member for Beloeil—Chambly to start over.

Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture announced \$500 million a year for arts and culture in the budget.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Yves-François Blanchet: Mr. Speaker, could you please get those clowns under control?

The minister could have announced \$1.5 billion, at no cost to taxpayers, had he not scrapped the tax on multinational Internet companies. It would have been paid for by multinationals, which do not pay taxes in Canada. Now, Quebecers and Canadians are on the hook for that \$500 million.

Am I supposed to congratulate the minister for that?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the leader of the Bloc Québécois. We did not announce \$500 million in the budget for arts and culture across the country. We announced \$770 million, the largest investment in Canadian history.

That includes \$38 million for local media, and the Bloc Québécois voted against that. It includes \$6 million a year for the Canada Council for the Arts, and the Bloc Québécois voted against that. It includes \$150 million for Telefilm Canada, and the Bloc Québécois voted against that. It also includes \$26 million for the National Film Board of Canada, the largest investment in decades for that organization, and the Bloc Québécois voted against that.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister scrapped \$1.5 billion that could have gone to arts and culture. In response to my colleague's question about the lack of funding for private television and radio, the minister said that he is giving \$150 million to Radio-Canada and the CBC. I was a Radio-Canada commentator myself, and I have the utmost respect for the professionals who work there.

However, am I expected to congratulate the minister for completely turning his back on private television and radio?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Bloc Québécois was once the president of ADISQ. This budget provides \$41 million for the music sector over the next three years, yet the Bloc Québécois voted against it. It provides \$38 million a year for local media, and the Bloc Québécois voted against it. Quebecor is receiving millions of dollars under this budget, and the Bloc Québécois voted against it. The Bloc Québécois's position is outrageous.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the minister wants to play that game, I can remind him that he was once senior director of Equiterre.

The minister does not seem to appreciate the scale of the crisis. News thrives on diversity, regional services, the French language and independence. The \$150 million for CBC/Radio-Canada does not serve that goal. Private television and radio stations are essential. They are feeling threatened, swept aside and abandoned.

Is the government actually planning the end of private media? Is it doing this on purpose? Are Quebecers supposed to applaud it for that?

• (1435)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the leader of the Bloc Québécois to read CBC/Radio-Canada's annual report and the strategic plan that was recently released, which states quite clearly that CBC/Radio-

Oral Questions

Canada will invest in opening local news stations across the country, including in Quebec. It is \$150 million, and it is our first investment in CBC/Radio-Canada. Bloc members voted against the largest investment in culture for Quebec. The Bloc Québécois's position is frankly outrageous.

* * *

FINANCE

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the new Liberal Prime Minister's first budget is a credit card budget, with a \$78 billion deficit. That is \$16 billion more than the Liberals promised during the election campaign. I do not need a Ph.D. from Oxford University to know that running deficits means fobbing the bill off on our children, our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren. In fact, Fitch Ratings has warned that federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration.

When will this government respond positively and manage the situation responsibly?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear my colleague criticizing this budget. I want to approach this budget from a woman's perspective. I am a woman, and I have had all kinds of experiences as a woman. Whenever the other side talks about women, they often talk about them as victims: victims of violence in their private lives or victims because they have trouble paying for groceries.

This budget will enable women to regain their purchasing power through social programs. It will give women the ability to get good jobs through economic diversification. It also supports—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, who would have believed it? The current Prime Minister is worse than Justin Trudeau when it comes to compulsive deficits. Something really needs to be done about this. Let me quote someone who, on March 11, 2015, said that balancing the budget "is the best way to maintain the credibility and financial stability of the province". Do members know who said that in 2015? It was the current Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry. He balanced the budget in Quebec. As a Quebecer, I am pleased about that, but as a Canadian, I have concerns.

Why is he not a member of cabinet, directly advising the Prime Minister, who should be balancing the budget?

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 responds to the needs of the time. We are investing in building strong families and communities across Canada. The investments will create jobs and careers for young people and protect the support measures that help families and enable them to get ahead. Our budget has a plan for building, protecting and strengthening Canada. It is a shame that the members across the way voted against it.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Tim Uppal (Edmonton Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly credit card budget piles today's reckless spending onto tomorrow's taxpayers. Credit card agency Fitch Ratings says that the Liberals repeatedly blow past their own fiscal anchors, putting our credit rating at risk. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer is sounding the alarm on this financial mess.

How many more warnings will it take for the Prime Minister to rein in his out-of-control spending?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, trusting advice from the Conservative leader on this budget is like trusting a forecast by a weatherman who lives inside a snow globe.

On this side of the House, we are standing with Canada. People from Carleton knew it, progressive Conservative leaders knew it and Canadians knew it. It is time for the Conservatives to get real about the budget and support us in building the strongest economy in the G7.

Hon. Tim Uppal (Edmonton Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Canadians are putting nearly 50% more of their expenses on credit cards than they did in 2015. Monthly food bank visits have smashed all-time records, with 2 million Canadians a month visiting the food bank. Families that once used to donate to the food bank are now standing in line waiting for help. The Liberal government has made everything more expensive.

When will the Prime Minister stop his out-of-control spending that makes everything more unaffordable for Canadians?

• (1440)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election, NDP supporters, Green supporters and so many progressive Conservatives stood with us to form a new party to form a bold vision for this country. We went from coast to coast to coast. We listened to Canadians. We came forth with a transformational budget that will build our economy into the strongest economy in the G7.

It is time for the members opposite to stop the rhetoric, stop the slogans, stand with us and build a strong economy.

Costas Menegakis (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly credit card budget loads today's reckless spending onto tomorrow's taxpayers. After 10 years of the tired Liberals, Canadians are putting nearly 50% more of their expenses on their credit cards than in 2015. The parliamentary fiscal watchdog is ringing the alarm bell, saying, "With Budget 2025 the Government abandoned the previous fiscal anchor to reduce the federal debt-to-GDP ratio over the medium term." It is no wonder the costly Prime Minister wants to fire him.

How many more fiscal watchdog reports is it going to take for the Prime Minister to rein in his costly credit card spending?

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, let me talk about the people in my riding, like

seniors, who are benefiting from the budget. When I talk to them, I hear about dental care and their saving \$800 a year. I hear about our new horizons program for seniors, supporting projects that affect seniors' quality of life. I hear about \$5 billion in the budget going to health care and hospital infrastructure.

Most importantly, I hear about a health heroes tax credit benefiting PSWs, who are the heart and soul of care in our communities. Do not take my word for it; SEIU Healthcare union president, Tyler Downey, says, "Putting more money directly into the pockets of PSWs will support retention and help strengthen care for Canada's seniors."

Costas Menegakis (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in one costly budget, the high-spending Liberals have managed to max out our great-grandchildren's credit cards. The parliamentary fiscal watchdog is not the only one ringing alarm bells. Fitch Ratings, the agency that gives the government its credit score, says that since the Liberal government frequently blows through its fiscal anchors, "federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration." Fitch is concerned. The parliamentary fiscal watchdog is sounding the alarm.

How many more fiscal watchdog reports is it going to take for the Prime Minister to rein in his costly credit card spending?

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, let me keep going. Let me talk about the youth in Toronto—St. Paul's, because this side of the House knows that our economic future depends on them. That is why we are saying that whatever ambition means to Canada's youth, whether it is to shape the future of AI, whether it is to join the climate corps, whether it is to make a great Canadian film, whether it is to study higher education or whether it is to work in the skilled trades, this budget is helping young Canadians from their first summer job all the way through the career-starting, lifelong job they are going to have.

Let us not take my word for it; let us talk about the YMCA, which says that paid skills training in this budget is going to strengthen resilience in our—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is using his budget like a credit card with no spending limit. The Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that the government has no fiscal anchors left. In my riding, the Petit-Saguenay sawmill is closing and 25 workers are losing their jobs. Families have no clue how they are going to pay their bills. In the meantime, the Prime Minister is spending like there is no tomorrow. What a gift to leave future generations.

Why does the Prime Minister keep putting our public finances in jeopardy?

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we should be talking about indigenous families and families living in Quebec's regions. All the families back home in my riding felt that the budget has truly increased and maintained programs for the most vulnerable members of our communities. It is a budget that will protect them, but the opposition voted against it.

We want to know this: Is the process of spending on credit not really a process of defending Canada?

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, loyalty is a virtue. I am loyal to Quebec and to Quebec sovereignty. The Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions has shown that she is loyal to the Quebec Liberal Party and to Pablo Rodriguez, even as new revelations emerge about the legality of their financial practices. To each their own loyalties. However, the minister's federalist and Liberal loyalties are making her say some strange things.

Can she clarify how a hypothetical Quebec currency would drive Quebec into Donald Trump's arms?

• (1445)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague would venture to talk in the House of Commons about the Parti Québécois's new plan to create a new currency for Quebec.

Quebeckers are very concerned. They are wondering whether there is really going to be a third referendum, whether we are going to lose our purchasing power and whether, at a time when the American president is threatening Canada's sovereignty, we are really going to weaken our position as Quebeckers by handing the reins over to Paul St-Pierre Plamondon so he can invent his own currency.

That would be absurd.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, and the shadows of Jean Chrétien and Jean Charest fall over Parliament.

The minister's reasoning is clear. The bigger the country, the stronger the currency. Let us assume that is true, although I would

be happy to offer her an internship with my colleague from Mirabel.

In the meantime, based on her own logic, does that mean she thinks Canada should scrap its own dollar and adopt the U.S. dollar?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is really living in the world of political fiction, but that is good because it shows people from the various caucuses of all the other parties what is really going on within the Parti Québécois in Quebec and the Bloc Québécois here.

One thing is clear: We will be there for Quebeckers with our 44 members in the House. We will defend our economy and our jobs. We will invest and we will ultimately strengthen Canada's sovereignty.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every time the Prime Minister flies out of the country for another glittering photo op, things get worse for Canadians. He went to China and came back with more tariffs on Canadian canola. He went to the U.S. and came back with double the tariffs on cars and triple the tariffs on steel and aluminum. Now the two sides are not even talking. Then he went to the U.K., and he still could not land a basic deal for our pork and beef farmers.

Why is it that every time the Prime Minister boards a plane, Canadians get sacked with a bigger bill?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the deputy leader of the Conservative Party should ask the question in reverse. Why is it that when the Leader of the Opposition flies out of the city to far-flung places across our vast and grand land, his polling results go down every single time he lands at a great Canadian airport? The deputy leader should demand more of her leader and demand bigger results from her leader. The deputy leader needs to step up.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is a lecture from a government that cannot close a deal on canola. It cannot close a deal on softwood lumber, on autos, on steel and on aluminum, basically every export that is the backbone of the Canadian economy.

The Prime Minister sold Canadians hope and he did not deliver. Then he used that broken trust as a reason to collect more stamps in his own passport. He is jet-setting on another taxpayer-funded vacation to Dubai while jobs in Windsor and Oshawa are going south.

Is the Prime Minister obsessed with foreign travel because he likes spending other people's money, or is it that he just cannot face Canadians at home?

Oral Questions

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that Canada has a AAA credit rating. Inflation has been within the Bank of Canada's target range for almost two years. Interest rates are down, job numbers are exceeding expectations and budget 2025 makes generational investments that the head of the International Monetary Fund welcomes. These investments will pay dividends to Canadians over generations in the form of good-paying jobs, affordable homes, thriving and productive industries, resilient supply chains and infrastructure that connects our country and enables diverse trade.

The only question is, why do the Conservatives not believe in Canada?

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in just eight months, the Prime Minister has flown the friendly skies nearly 70 times on 28 different trips and burned through enough jet fuel to fly the equivalent of four times around the earth. What does he have to show for all of his gallivanting around in a private jet? He just has expensive photo ops, empty announcements and no real results for Canadian workers. Not only have these trips failed to get the deals he promised, but tariffs and costs for Canadians seem to go higher each time he takes off.

Why does the Prime Minister not stop his flights of fancy and start making life more affordable for Canadians here at home?

• (1450)

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, instead of talking down the economy, why do the Conservatives not join us and build the economy up? Let us see what we can agree on. Can we agree we want to lower taxes for Canadians? This budget did it. They voted against it. Can we agree we want to support innovators, small businesses and entrepreneurs? This budget did it. They voted against it.

Do not take my word for it. Just today, I was speaking with Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, and it represents 10,000 businesses. This budget makes meaningful steps to support manufacturers under pressure.

They should join us to build Canada—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope.

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while fancy art dealers and high-flying people like the Prime Minister are living their best life, here on the ground, a record number of Canadians are using food banks and struggling to heat their homes. They do not get to leave their troubles behind by jumping on a private jet. These swanky trips have done nothing for the tens of thousands of steel, auto and softwood lumber workers who have lost their jobs, and the millions more who are living with uncertainty due to the Prime Minister's broken promises on tariffs.

Why does the Prime Minister not spend less time on fancy travel and more time focusing on making life more affordable for Canadians?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the members opposite, Canadians know that we need to invest in ourselves, and that is exactly why they have supported this government and why they support this budget. From Canada's Building Trades Unions to the YMCA to Food Banks Canada, a variety of different stakeholders have advocated for the programs and approach in this budget.

People are happy. They are happy with a government that has ambition on their behalf. We are not going to stop, because we are creating the jobs of today and tomorrow.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all the Prime Minister has achieved is higher air miles, higher altitudes and higher tariffs. With 28 trips and enough kilometres travelled to circle the earth four times, Canadians expect more than just photo ops and hollow letters of intent.

When he travelled to China, Canadians got higher tariffs. When he travelled to India, Canadians got higher tariffs. When he travelled to Washington, Canadians got higher tariffs.

Why are Canadian families paying the price with higher tariffs for the Prime Minister to jet around the globe for photo ops and deals for Brookfield?

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is from Manitoba and we need to recognize that Manitobans want to vote for this budget. They want to for the port of Churchill. They want us to build, protect and empower the north.

This is the first time we are seeing these types of investments in generations. I encourage the member to get on board and vote for them to ensure we make the national school food program permanent.

THE ECONOMY

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, the House reiterated its confidence in our government and in budget 2025. Indeed, budget 2025 is an expression of confidence in Canada.

In the face of uncertainty, Canadians are going to build a future we want for ourselves. That includes our new buy Canadian policy, which is strengthening our economy by prioritizing Canadian-made steel, aluminum and softwood lumber. It is supporting local jobs, protecting industries impacted by international tariffs and reinforcing our commitment to stable supply chains.

Can the secretary of state speak to the broad support for this buy Canadian policy?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the buy Canadian policy outlined in budget 2025 will leverage every public dollar to strengthen Canada's economy and create jobs. Do not take my word for it. Ask the members for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, Jonquière and Lac-Saint-Jean. They all joined our government in announcing and applauding this policy last week, only to vote against it a few days later.

Canadians notice that while that side of the House is putting partisan politics above results, we are building the strongest economy in the G7.

* * *

• (1455)

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is acting like a real tourist. In his first eight months as Prime Minister, he has taken 28 trips on a private jet and covered enough kilometres to circle the globe four times. However, he has no agreements or meaningful results to show for it, just good intentions and photo ops on the taxpayers' dime.

Why is it that every time the Prime Minister boards a plane to meet foreign leaders, Canadians end up paying even higher tariffs?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, given the choice between a Prime Minister who visits our allies and trade partners to diversify our markets and an opposition leader who spends his time disparaging our institutions on obscure podcasts, the choice is clear and simple. Canadians made the right choice.

We are focusing on diversifying markets to reduce our dependence on the United States, stimulate our economy, increase our productivity and build the strongest economy in the G7.

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that makes absolutely no difference to the tens of thousands of steel, auto and softwood lumber workers who have lost their jobs because of the Liberal government's tariff failures.

Canadian businesses are asking for an agreement with the United States to ensure predictable revenues. Why is it that every time the

Oral Questions

Prime Minister travels to warmer climes, the tariffs go up and Canadians are left footing the bill?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have seen better from my colleague.

I think my colleague should spend more time with people in the auto sector, the forestry sector and the steel and aluminum sector.

Why? These individuals are asking us to open international markets and reduce our dependence on the U.S., as my colleague from Louis-Hébert was saying. That is because it is very, very important for us to be able to export our aluminum, our forestry products and our steel to Europe and Asia.

That is exactly what the Prime Minister and the team are doing.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, “Sometimes you're trying to choose between bills and feeding your kids.” That is a direct quote from Thunder Bay mom Cassandra Shedden, who relies on formula to feed her infant child. She describes rummaging around her house, looking for things to sell just so she can put formula in her baby's bottle.

Why will the Prime Minister not do something so that parents can afford to buy baby formula?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, nobody should have to feel the fear that Cassandra feels, but I will note what Cassandra also said. She said she could hardly wait until the Canada child benefit arrived on the 20th of each month because it helped her feed her baby, as she lived on Ontario disability.

The member voted against the Canada child benefit. She voted against school food. She voted against the very people she has the temerity to stand up and quote in this House.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since 2017, inflation on baby formula has become double what it is in the U.S. We are overly reliant on imported infant formula, and we only have one plant in Canada, which means that every single tax on transportation, every supply chain disruption and every single tariff threat hits Canadian families harder. This is due to a lack of any kind of action from any of the Liberals for the last 10 years.

Oral Questions

Will they finally make this a priority so that parents can afford to feed their babies formula?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, maybe the member did not read the article where Canada research chair Ms. Lesley Frank said that the Canada child benefit should be increased, which, by the way, it is every year because it is pegged to inflation, and where the experts said that formula should be produced in Canada. In this budget, we have money for innovation in agriculture.

How does that member think that Canada will be able to do anything if she votes against Canadians' interests time and time again?

• (1500)

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is deeply wrong is the fact that parents are waiting every single day for those cheques just so they can afford to put groceries on the table. What is deeply wrong is that mothers are begging strangers online for money just so they can afford to buy baby formula. What is deeply wrong is that parents are resorting to buying opened bottles and cases of powdered formula, just so they can feed their kids. This is because of the government's lack of action.

Will the Liberals actually do something other than just create more bureaucracy? We need action.

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members like that one, with the fake outrage as their colleagues stand up and vote against the very—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Mr. Speaker, just the other day, the member for Bowmanville—Oshawa North suggested that hungry children should go without because parents should be able to afford to feed their kids. Well, I have a news flash: Single mothers, just like I was in my day, need all the help they can get, and that is what we do for moms every single day in the House.

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is from a minister who is completely out of touch with Canadians, who are struggling day in and day out to afford the very basic necessities of life.

Meanwhile, the members across the way are heckling me while Canadians struggle and are going to food banks in droves. That is because of the government's mismanagement, and it can do something about it. One of the things the Liberals could do about it would be to scrap the fuel tax, which would bring down the cost of groceries. Why is the government hell-bent on keeping the fuel tax and making sure that Canadians cannot afford basic necessities?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the member opposite fails to acknowledge is that she voted against every measure that helps single mothers right now, every single day. Whether it is fees reduced for early learning and child care, access to dental care

for children who do not have dental care benefits or fighting against school food, these Conservatives stand up to say they feel the pain of moms, especially single moms, but when push comes to shove, they vote against them time and again.

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what the minister is saying is that, through socialist programs, Canadians can be provided for. Canadians should be able to make ends meet—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: There is nothing unparliamentary about that word.

The hon. member for Lethbridge, from the top.

Rachael Thomas: Mr. Speaker, grocery prices in this country have risen 40% faster than in the United States of America. That goes to prove that it has a whole lot to do with the government and its socialist policies.

Statistics Canada shows that beef is up 17%, chicken is up 6%, apples are up 4% and baby formula is up 6%. Baby formula is the most stolen item in a grocery store because parents are desperate due to the government's mismanagement. Folks are suffering.

I hosted a town hall last week. Their faces and their stories came forward. These are more than stats, folks. What will the government do about it?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is why I am so proud to be a Liberal. Liberals believe in helping each other.

We believe that, when a single mom is having a tough time, we should be there for her. We believe that, when a family is down on their luck, we should have an employment insurance program that helps people out when they lose their jobs. We believe that, when people cannot access dental care, sometimes for up to 20 years and are living in pain, we should do something about that as a country.

That is what Canadians believe. It is why we are known for our universal health care system. We care about each other.

Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, driving up the cost of everything. Year after year, food costs have gone up and the Liberals want us to pay more for their food packaging taxes. The Liberal tax on food costs Canadians an additional \$5.6 billion a year, driving up the cost for fresh produce by over 34%.

Why is the Prime Minister keeping the food packaging tax and making everything more expensive for struggling Canadians?

• (1505)

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 long years, I have been telling the people of Saskatchewan that, as a result of the mismanagement under Stephen Harper, the government has spent these years cleaning up Harper's mess so we can go on a bold new journey.

There is \$51 billion set aside to help Canada build its communities. That is an impressive amount of money. The Saskatchewan MP should wake up, vote for the budget and back up Saskatchewan.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Dalwinder Gill (Calgary McKnight, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, driving up the cost of everything.

The Prime Minister told Canadians to judge him by the prices they see at our grocery stores. Now, the industrial carbon tax has caused food prices in Canada to rise nearly 40% faster than in the U.S.

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

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in budget 2025, we are making generational investments to build Canada strong.

Again, we have cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. This is making sure we put more money back into their pockets.

We are also supporting our young people. We have created new pathways to support them. This is 175,000 jobs for young people through the Canada summer jobs and student work placement programs. We are empowering youth to gain the skills they need.

We are going to continue to build Canada strong and support our youth in this country.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last spring, my hometown of Richmond voted for a government that would develop clean, reliable electricity to power our economy. In British Columbia, the north coast transmission line has just been referred to the Major Projects Office. It will twin key transmission corridors, reinforce B.C.'s clean grid in the northwest and support industry while connecting communities.

Can the minister explain how this project will support B.C. jobs and lower emissions while helping Canada realize its potential as a critical mineral producer and clean energy superpower?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the north coast transmission line is ex-

Oral Questions

actly the kind of enabling infrastructure Canada needs to get to net zero, become a clean energy superpower and diversify our exports. Once in operation, it is expected to support thousands of direct jobs and help avoid up to three million tonnes of carbon emissions every year. By unlocking our vast natural resources and powering new industries with low-carbon electricity, we are giving workers and communities what they want.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Abbotsford residents woke to the news of yet another shooting linked to extortion in our communities. Far too many families and businesses across the region have been affected. Under the Liberal's soft-on-crime policies, extortion has risen over 500% in B.C. alone. In my community, 100 shootings have been linked to extortion.

Why do the Liberals block our request for an emergency debate? When will the Prime Minister finally get serious about extortion?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Liberals did not block any kind of debate, as the member is well aware. The Speaker made that ruling yesterday.

Second, the best thing to stop extortion is deterrence. If criminals knew they would be caught, they would not be involved in such crimes. One way to deter criminals is to make sure we give police officers the tools they need to be able to catch them.

We have brought lawful access measures in Bill C-2 in the House. Guess who is blocking them? The Conservatives are. They will not allow the police to have the tools needed to catch these criminals.

• (1510)

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals took power, extortion is up 330% in Canada. There have been 100 reported extortions already in Surrey, Abbotsford and Delta. The Prime Minister recently visited British Columbia, and he said nothing about this pressing problem.

The question is this: Why are these Liberals allowing extortions to run rampant, whether it be in Calgary, Windsor, Surrey or Brampton? Why?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House has before it measures, contained in Bill C-2, that would give the police long-requested abilities to prevent extortion and to catch extortionists and criminals in our country. The Conservatives, and the Conservatives alone, stood in the way of those particular measures, demanding their removal from Bill C-2.

That member needs to talk to his whip, talk to his leader, and get out of the way of law enforcement to stop extortion in this country. That member needs to stand for law and order.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap. Actions speak louder than words. That minister needs to look in the mirror.

That member voted against a Conservative bill to put extortionists in jail. That member voted for house arrest for people who do extortion with a firearm. That member voted to repeal mandatory jail time for extortion with a firearm. Talk about being out of touch. Talk about missing the boat on justice.

When will the Liberals get on board and tackle extortion across this country? When?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is taking real action to stop those who commit extortion. The Conservatives, on the other hand, have failed to support these measures, such as lawful access, a measure that every single law enforcement agency and every single police association have been asking for. They have been asking the Conservative Party to step up to ensure that Bill C-2, with lawful access, is passed.

I urge the member opposite, who is my critic, to step forward today to ensure that lawful access becomes law.

* * *

HOUSING

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians and the great people of Scarborough—Woburn voted for a government to build more homes, and they are looking to their new federal government to lead with real solutions.

Could the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure update the House on what concrete steps the government is taking to accelerate the building of affordable homes here in Ontario?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Scarborough—Woburn for all of his hard work.

We are committed to delivering a massive increase in affordable housing, starting in the GTA and all across Canada. Just last week, we made generational investments across the country to create more than 3,000 homes across Canada for Canadians, and that includes over 1,500 much-needed homes in Ontario. Those homes will give local families an opportunity to be more stable and have affordable places to live.

It is time to build Canada strong.

FIREARMS

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the \$742-million gun grab has been a complete disaster from day one. It is wrapped in controversy, with leaked audio revealing that the public safety minister himself admitted that it will not work.

The Cape Breton pilot program reportedly only had 22 firearms turned in. Now, the police chief overseeing the program, who is the brother-in-law of the Liberal member, is suddenly retiring. Will the Liberals finally admit that the program is a waste of taxpayers' money, admit that it has failed, and scrap it?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, apart from partisan politics, this member, who is from my province of Newfoundland and Labrador, voted against a budget that invests in Canada and invests in our province. She voted against 46,000 families who will see an increase in the Canada child benefit, families who rely on the food—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1515)

The Speaker: There is way too much loud heckling, and we cannot hear the minister. Sometimes we cannot even hear the members of the colleagues' own party.

The Minister of Fisheries can start from the top, please.

Hon. Joanne Thompson: Mr. Speaker, instead of playing partisan politics, let us focus on Canadians.

The member opposite from Newfoundland and Labrador voted against a budget that invests in Canada; invests in our province in rural communities, roads, bridges, schools and hospitals; and invests in families with the school nutrition program's \$800 savings a year for a family with two children. There is the family benefit that 46,000 families rely on, and there is an increase.

Shame on the member.

* * *

TAXATION

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been said, "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value."

The Liberal budget chose to slash public services and cut front-line jobs, but it eliminated a tax on luxury yachts and private jets. To cover this blatant gift to the rich, the finance minister claimed that the tax cost more to administer than it raised, but that is not true; the luxury tax brought in 20 times what it cost, raising hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

What value should Canadians take from the Liberals' choice?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague, but I think he should call Lana Payne, the head of Unifor, which represents the Bombardier workers in Montreal. That is because, following the fact that we changed the tax regime on that particular aspect linked to jets, Bombardier announced 600 new jobs in Montreal and Quebec.

Obviously, like the NDP, we are in favour of unionized jobs, we are in favour of creating jobs and we will fight for these ones.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table two reports in both official languages.

The first is copies of the 2022-23 “Annual Report on the State of Inuit Culture and Society: Policing”.

The second is copies of the Yukon land claims and self-government agreement implementation report for 2017 to 2022.

I request that both reports be referred to the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

* * *

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of reports in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, Canada's combined second and third reports on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities dated November 7, 2022, including the 2025 concluding observations of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Routine Proceedings

• (1520)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, reports of the Canadian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for the following activities: the CPA Executive Committee Meeting held in London, United Kingdom, from May 12 to 13, 2025; the Belize National Assembly Post-Election Seminar held in Belmopan, Belize, from June 4 to 6, 2025; and the 68th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference held in Bridgetown, Barbados, from October 5 to 12, 2025.

* * *

PETITIONS

FALUN GONG

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I bring the voices of Canadians who bring the following. The Chinese Communist Party has engaged in a 26-year campaign of eradication against Falun Gong practitioners, who have suffered human rights abuses including mass arbitrary detentions. They have not only suffered that within China but have also been subjected to transnational repression, including bomb threats and shooting threats against Shen Yun, a classical Chinese dance and music performance presented globally.

The G7 leaders have condemned transnational repression; therefore, petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to publicly call on the Chinese regime to end its persecution of Falun Gong in China and its transnational repression abroad; continue to impose sanctions to pursue accountability for CCP officials and their proxies; and take stronger measures to protect the Falun Gong community targeted by foreign repression.

TAXATION

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians, we pride ourselves on having free health care, but that is not entirely true. Dental care, physiotherapy, chiropractor services and massage therapy are all forms of health care that Canadians have to pay for, but to add insult to injury, thousands of Canadians are actually paying GST and HST on their health care. Even with a doctor's referral, Canadians are paying GST and HST on massage therapy. People in my riding are frustrated about the inequity.

Routine Proceedings

On almost all forms of health care, including dental care, physio and chiropractor services, Canadians do not have to pay GST, but they do have to pay it on massage therapy; therefore I am pleased to present on their behalf a petition to remove GST and HST on massage therapy.

ISRAEL

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present petition e-6662, which was signed by nearly 11,000 Canadians. The petitioners wish to call the attention of the Government of Canada to the actions of the Government of Israel in the West Bank and Gaza, dating back to 1967; its repeated violations of international law; and the continued suffering experienced by the Palestinians to this day.

Until Israel withdraws from the occupied Palestinian territories, petitioners call on Canada to end the sale of military equipment, cancel its free trade agreement and ensure that all who have violated Canadian or international law face justice.

• (1525)

BASIC INCOME GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, within the Waterloo region are five ridings, and I am pleased to represent the good people of the riding of Waterloo.

Dozens of constituents within the region of Waterloo have signed a petition calling on the Government of Canada to work with Prince Edward Island's special committee on poverty. They are talking about the guaranteed basic income program. A pilot within P.E.I. was suggested. Constituents would really like the Government of Canada to advance this important work to implement a guaranteed basic income program demonstration. I am pleased to present this petition on their behalf.

AGRICULTURE

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise on behalf of constituents of mine from Courtenay, Cumberland, Errington and Parksville who have all signed a petition. They cite that when the Plant Breeders' Rights Act was amended in 2015, farmers rang the bell that the age-old right to save seed on their own farms was being reframed as farmer's privilege, which could be taken away by regulation. They warned that future governments could side with foreign multinationals that want to force farmers to buy seed from them and pay royalties every year, and that the CFIA's proposed regulatory amendment would do just that, starting with fruit, vegetable, ornamental and hybrid varieties.

The thousands of petitioners are calling on the government to abandon this corporate paragraph and say no to proposed changes that would remove farmer's privilege for new varieties of fruit, ornamental and vegetable plants and hybrid varieties.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, petitioners from my community, as well as others, have petitioned the House to please, in the House, take note of the reality that the signatories and parties to the Paris Agreement, including Canada, have committed to pursuing efforts to limit temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and as far below 2°C as possible. They

call upon the Government of Canada to take bold climate action to ensure that Canada pulls its weight in the world.

In summary, petitioners call for Canada to reduce greenhouse gases, and to do so by arresting the growth in oil sands expansion, opposing all new fossil fuel infrastructure and working with the provinces to phase out the few remaining places where there is coal-fired electricity, while investing in the transition to a prosperous, decarbonized economy.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table a petition on behalf of residents of Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford who are concerned with the rising rates of organized violence, extortion, shootings and intimidation across the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. Daylight shootings, murders and other acts of violence highlight a more systemic public safety crisis. The petitioners mourn the tragic death of Darshan Singh Sahsi.

Residents call upon the Government of Canada to reinforce the process of public reporting so Canadians can clearly see how federal, provincial and local municipalities are working together to prevent further increases in violent and organized crime.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of British Columbians who are concerned about human trafficking. They are calling upon the Government of Canada to strengthen the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act to address its shortcomings and put an end to human trafficking in Canada.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROJECT

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition I would like to present today is on behalf of angered parents who are concerned about the actions of BC Housing and its proposed safe consumption site across the street from Abbotsford Traditional School.

The petitioners are calling upon the federal government to enforce the decriminalization policies, the protection of children, that were in that agreement with British Columbia and halt all funding to BC Housing until it removes this proposed project and finds an alternative location for this housing project.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today.

First, I rise to present the following petition. The petitioners state that it is unacceptable for Canadians to choose medical assistance in dying due to a lack of available services or treatments. This is not a real choice. They point out that allowing MAID for people with disabilities or chronic non-terminal illnesses devalues their lives. It sends the dangerous message that life with a disability is optional.

A recent article in *Le Soleil* told the disturbing story of a sick man who was basically advised by a social worker to give up the fight and choose death. That is not compassion. It is a betrayal of our duty to protect human dignity.

The petitioners are therefore calling upon the Government of Canada to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting MAID for people whose prognosis is more than six months. Offering death is not true compassion. True compassion is offering support, listening and hope.

- (1530)

[English]

DUTY EXEMPTIONS

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I am tabling today has been brought to me by members of the Ukrainian community. They highlight that more than 200,000 Ukrainians have found safe haven in Canada since 2022. While the cost of living is affecting Canadians across the country, it is also deeply challenging for newcomers. Many face emotional and financial pressures, including the high costs of importing personal belongings from Ukraine.

[Translation]

Canada's current duty-free limit for international packages remains at just \$20, and that has not changed since 1992. Because of this, Ukrainians are often subject to customs duties when receiving personal items sent by their families, which makes their lives more difficult.

[English]

The petitioners urge the government to raise the duty-free limit for packages from Ukraine to at least \$150, which is in line with humanitarian principles and reciprocal measures under the Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third and final petition I am tabling today raises concern about recommendation 430 in the finance committee's pre-budget report. This recommendation calls for the stripping of charitable status from all houses of worship from all faith communities. Petitioners are deeply concerned about this proposal, and although this was not contained in this particular budget, the government has yet to repudiate this recommendation.

Petitioners call on the government never to implement the recommendations of its own Liberal-dominated finance committee, particularly recommendation 430.

DISABILITY SUPPORTS

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of Canadians who are concerned about access to disability supports for those living with severe mental illness.

The petitioners note that Canadians diagnosed with conditions such as bipolar disorder and schizophrenia continue to face greater barriers when trying to apply for federal disability programs. They believe current forms do not fully recognize the serious and life-altering impacts of psychological disabilities.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to improve how disability related to mental illness is assessed so vulnerable Canadians and their families can receive the support they need. I am honoured to table this petition on their behalf.

* * *

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. 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407 and 408 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled in electronic format immediately.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

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

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[Translation]***MAKING LIFE MORE AFFORDABLE FOR CANADIANS
ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-4, An Act respecting certain affordability measures for Canadians and another measure, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Speaker: There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (for the Minister of Finance and National Revenue) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in at report stage.

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

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, I propose it be adopted on division.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1535)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to a very important piece of legislation, a legislation we had a great deal of discussion on following the federal election in April. The Prime Minister and the Liberal caucus are committed to building the strongest economy in the G7. This is something we have talked a great deal about, but more important than talking about it, the government has undertaken many initiatives to ensure that we are on track to be the strongest economy in the G7 countries.

We take the issue very seriously. A number of pieces of legislation, Bill C-4 being one of them, were introduced shortly after the last election in order to address the issues that came out of the election and the general feeling in terms of how we needed to be there for Canadians in all regions of the country.

When we reflect on Bill C-4, it principally does three things: It provides a tax break for over 22 million Canadians. More than half the population of Canada is receiving a tax break.

We hear a lot about the issue of affordability, and we are very much concerned about this issue. This is why, when we hear Conservatives stand in their place, and they talk and try to challenge us on the affordability issue, I would like for them to reflect on their position on the budget, on such issues as Bill C-4. Affordability through Bill C-4 is literally putting money in the pockets of Canadians, directly through a tax break.

We understand and we appreciate that individuals are having a difficult time on the issue of affordability. This is why it was so im-

portant we bring in the legislation, as we made the commitment to do in the last election. Our Prime Minister assumed the role of Prime Minister earlier this year, not that long ago. One of the very first actions he took in sitting in the Prime Minister's chair was to give Canadians a tax break on the carbon tax, recognizing that getting rid of the carbon tax would have a positive impact for Canadians too.

I know the Conservatives do not necessarily like this, but it is one of the issues that clearly shows that the Liberal Party was able to make the changes from within to address the needs and desires of the Canadian population, which ultimately put us in a better position going into the last federal election. When I reflect on that election, I note that a number of issues came to the table. One of them, and I have referenced it in the past, is the three Ts: Trump, tariffs and trade, and the impact that was actually having on Canada.

We have a Prime Minister with an incredible background, a background that saw him appointed as the Governor of the Bank of Canada. Interestingly enough, it was actually Stephen Harper who appointed him to that position, because of his credentials. He was also the governor of the Bank of England. He is an economist, someone who truly understands how an economy works. I think Canadians reflected on that when they compared the two leaders.

They can see the types of actions the Prime Minister has taken, Bill C-4 included; there are two significant tax breaks. There is, first, as I said, getting rid of the carbon tax, and, second, through Bill C-4, giving the tax break to 22 million Canadians.

• (1540)

However, that is not where it stops. There is more to Bill C-4. Not only would it take the carbon tax out of the law and give tax breaks, but it would give a tax exemption on GST for first-time homebuyers, giving first-time homebuyers an opportunity to afford a bit more when purchasing a home valued up to \$1 million.

These are the types of initiatives the Prime Minister took virtually out of the gate. We recognize that so much can be done to support Canadians on the affordability issue. We looked across the way to the Conservatives and presented a budget, and all but two of them voted against it. They need to know what they voted against, along with the tax breaks we have been talking about.

There is the national school food program, a program that I have had the opportunity to raise, as many of my colleagues have in question period. It is interesting to see the response we get from the Conservative Party. The national school food program is much like the national dental program, the national pharmacare program and the child care program. We can even go into the Canada child benefit program. The Conservatives have voted against all of that.

Government Orders

Interestingly enough, the program I want to highlight is the national school food program. I find some of the questions hard to believe. Today, members stood up and talked about children, and they asked what the government is doing to support food for children. Members should put some thought into what they voted against before they ask some of the questions they ask.

The national school food program for children provides financial support, working with the provinces, to ensure that young children in schools have breakfast, something nutritious, which is critically important. We have the far right within the Conservatives saying it is a garbage program. They do not understand. Then we get others who say they want parents to feed their own children.

I have pointed this fact out before. I have been a parliamentarian for many years, serving in Manitoba. I am a very big fan of Sharon Carstairs; she was one of my mentors. I remember that back in the late eighties, she said we have hundreds of children in Manitoba who are going to school on an empty stomach, and they cannot learn like that. There are many reasons we have children who do not have the opportunity to have breakfast. This program provides children the opportunity to learn while there is something in their tummies. Then we have this reaction from the Conservatives.

If it were completely up to me, I would be inclined to bring in legislation to put the program in place. The Conservatives have been very clear: They do not support it. That is where we see the contrast. When we have a sound social policy to support our children, the Conservatives, for far-right reasons, say no to it. They are then critical of the government and say we do not care about children. Are they serious?

● (1545)

Take a look at all the things we do to support children that the Conservatives have voted against. That is the reason I do not support the many actions the Conservative Party has taken. Take a look at how long it has taken us to get Bill C-4 to this stage. It was introduced months ago.

An. hon. member: It is your agenda.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the point is that the opportunities are there, and I would hope the Conservative Party recognizes the value of the initiatives we are taking.

I believe that last summer, the Conservatives might have even voted in favour of Bill C-4. Now things have changed. Their leader has gotten elected here, so that might have changed the dynamics somewhat, but the point is that at least in principle, it appears they support some of the initiatives. I think they should go the extra mile and recognize the value within the budget itself, because there are many initiatives that Bill C-4 would build upon in regard to the budget we presented.

I would like to make reference to a couple of the initiatives that I feel are really important for us to recognize.

One is investing in our communities, with literally hundreds of millions of dollars virtually every year for a number of years now. We are going to be investing in infrastructure that deals with hospitals, roads, bridges and community facilities. Addressing things of

that nature is how we build stronger infrastructure for our economy. That is a big part of this.

Today in question period, a number of Conservatives stood up and attempted to mock the Prime Minister because of his travel. I would ultimately argue that the Prime Minister is doing exactly what he should be doing. At a time of uncertainty, no one here can predict what President Donald Trump might say, but what we do know is that Canada needs to lessen our reliance on U.S.-Canada trade. That does not mean to ignore it. We love it, we want to see it grow and we will do what we can on it, but it is really important that we expand trade opportunities beyond the United States. We have a Prime Minister who truly understands that, even though the Conservative Party is negative toward this sort of travel.

Things do not just happen overnight; they take time, and we have achieved a great deal. I was glad that the Prime Minister was in Malaysia, because while he was in Malaysia, he met with President Marcos of the Philippines. A healthy discussion took place, with them in essence saying they wanted to achieve a trade agreement between Canada and the Philippines in 2026. Is that not positive? I would argue yes.

We now have Bill C-13, which would ultimately allow for more trade opportunities between Canada, Great Britain and Northern Ireland. It is a substantial piece of legislation, like Bill C-4 before us. What would it do? It would enable us to have more trade between Canada, England and Northern Ireland.

Take a look at what has happened in Indonesia. The Prime Minister has reached out there, and we will see, once again, that agreements are being made as a direct result of having a Prime Minister who is committed to expanding trade opportunities beyond the Canada-U.S. border.

● (1550)

When we take a look at what Bill C-4 would do, it is all part of a plan to build Canada as the strongest economy in the G7. We need to recognize that in order to protect Canada's economic sovereignty, we have to be aware of what is taking place at the ground level and why it is important that we provide tax relief. We also have to be aware of what is taking place outside our borders and respond to it.

That is why members will see a huge commitment, which we have not seen for generations, toward our military. Raising spending to 2% of GDP is a substantial commitment that will make a difference in virtually every region of our country as we expand opportunities for Canadian businesses and as we invest and beef up our Canadian military. These are the types of things that have impacts on where we are with our taxation levels and how we expand on things of that nature.

Government Orders

We can talk about the local level. I made reference to what the Prime Minister has done internationally, but members should take a look at what we have done at the local level. Virtually immediately after the last federal election, the Prime Minister was meeting with provinces, territories and indigenous leaders to talk about the importance of having one Canadian economy, which ultimately led to Bill C-5.

Bill C-5 amplified the need for us to have one Canadian economy. It deals with labour as well, and the mobility of labour in our country. It is a critically important area that was led by the Prime Minister, who worked with premiers, indigenous leaders and others so we could present, through Bill C-5, a major project proposal that has now had two runs. In the first run, the total accumulation had \$60 billion of investment coming down the pipe, which is a significant amount of money. We can incorporate the second run, which I believe is over \$50 billion, but do not quote me on that, as I am not as familiar with it.

I can tell members that every region of the country will benefit by this. Whether it is copper mines in Saskatchewan, the port of Montreal, the latest thing in Atlantic Canada, LNG in B.C. or the work being done on the relationship building between Alberta and Ottawa, there has been a genuine attempt to make sure that all of Canada's regions benefit.

It is just like Bill C-4, which is providing opportunities to deal with another important issue, affordability. On the housing aspect, it is interesting that not only does the tax break for first-time homebuyers help people directly; it also helps the housing industry by making things more affordable.

I am very grateful that, through this legislation, a tax break would be given to Canadians. I would like to think that every member of all political entities in the House will get behind Bill C-4 and support Canadians. Over 22 million people would benefit by the tax break itself. However, to take a look at the broader picture of what this government has been able to accomplish in eight months, I think we are on the right track to making Canada strong with the strongest economy in the G7.

• (1555)

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct one thing the member said. It is not that Conservatives do not believe in the school lunch program; it is that we do not believe in driving parents into penury so that they have no choice but to use it.

The Liberals keep talking about a tax break for 22 million Canadians, but at the same time, they kept the industrial carbon tax, which effectively penalizes 40 million Canadians. If the member is serious about tax breaks, why would the Liberals not take off the industrial tax?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, as clarification for my colleague across the way, the Conservative Party's position on the national food program is to get rid of it. It does not even recognize its existence. That is the reality of the Conservative Party's position. If I am wrong, I look to the House leadership to come forward.

I would remind my friend across the way that some of his colleagues have called the program complete “garbage”, while others

have said it has not delivered anything. He might want to revisit that particular argument.

I see that my friend from Regina—Lewvan also wants to ask a question.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-4 eliminates pollution pricing for consumers, for individuals, but it does not propose any measures to offset the negative effects on the environment. Furthermore, members will recall that when the government eliminated the carbon tax, they sent a cheque to all Canadians outside Quebec. This little gift was sent out in the middle of the election campaign as a rebate for a tax that no longer existed.

That amounts to \$814 million taken out of Quebecers' pockets. The National Assembly unanimously requested that this money be returned to Quebecers. The Bloc Québécois raised this issue before the budget was tabled.

Does the government plan to give back the \$814 million that was stolen from Quebecers?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am very grateful for our new Prime Minister and the way he determined that we can, in fact, get rid of the carbon tax. That is what Bill C-4 would do.

I am very grateful that he has also recognized through this legislation that a direct tax break for all Canadians is needed. Obviously, that includes a break on income taxes, which are paid in every region of the country by some 22 million Canadians. I fully support that.

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a first-time MP and I have only been in the House for a few short months, but let me tell the House what I have observed. On this side of the House, when we talk about helping Canadians cope with the cost of living, we are introducing concrete measures, and when the time comes to vote, we are voting in favour of these measures.

As for members of the official opposition, they had a lot of questions for us lately about the cost of living and they got all riled up during question period, but when the time came to vote for concrete measures, they voted against measures to support affordability.

My colleague is a seasoned MP, so I would like to ask him whether it is common practice for members of the official opposition to oppose measures that provide support for Canadians.

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, look at the cost of living issue and think about the programs incorporated within the budget, such as the national food program that we have discussed, the pharmacare program, the dental care program, the child care program and the Canada child benefit program. All of these, collectively, are there to support children and others because of the cost of living issue, and other issues.

Both the Bloc and the Conservatives voted against the budget. I find they lost a great deal of credibility. During the budget debate, it was not like many of them stood up to say they liked this program or that program. There was only negativity toward the budget and, ultimately they voted no.

• (1600)

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I enjoy the speeches from the member for Winnipeg North because they are always full of interesting information that does not have much truth to it. We can tell when that happens because he gets louder and louder with the more information he talks about. When he gets really loud, we know he is telling a whopper of a tale.

We heard that in the debate he had with the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan at the University of Winnipeg last week. He got louder and louder as the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan kept on beating him in the debate.

I want to get back to the lunch program. I have asked this time and again, and I would love to have the member for Winnipeg North answer. Is it not an indictment of his government that it has to feed kids at school now because parents cannot afford to? The government caused that.

The Liberal government caused the affordability crisis by spending money it did not have and creating inflation. It made parents unable to feed their own kids. The school lunch program is an indictment of the last 10 years of failed Liberal policies.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about someone who does not understand reality, let us review that particular question. The member has no concept of what the program is, nor was he listening.

With respect to the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan and the debate that took place at the University of Winnipeg, I think he might want to review what actually took place. I have put out the challenge to the member to have a part two over at Carleton University here in Ottawa, and I look forward to having that debate as well. I would love to see the member who just spoke any time. I would even go to Regina to debate with him, but I suspect there is no way he would accept that challenge, because he knows he would be embarrassed.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the debate we are having today on this important legislation. Constituents in the riding of Waterloo have been sharing many comments and many concerns, so I was pleased to see that there were no report stage amendments and that we would go to debating the bill at third reading. We would like to see this bill passed so that Canadians can benefit from its impacts.

Another thing Canadians are saying is that this House used to have constructive feedback coming from a strong opposition, and there has been a lack of that. It seems that the official opposition does not want programs to be improved and it does not want to offer constructive feedback to ensure that more Canadians can benefit.

I understand that this legislation would benefit 22 million Canadians. We know times have been tough. I would like to understand from the member what he believes it is important for the Conservatives to do to help more Canadians and ensure that we can deliver, because that is the role we play.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I have a very quick note. When we take a look at the legislative agenda, we could talk about what we have brought in. We had Bill C-2 for safer borders. We have the lost Canadians bill. We have the tax break in today's legislation. We have the one Canadian economy bill. We have bills for critical cyber systems, to combat hate, for modern treaties and to transfer the military court to civilian court. We have the new borders bill in Bill C-12. We have the treaty between Canada, England and Northern Ireland. We have the bail reform legislation.

There is a lot of substance that would benefit Canadians. We ask for the Conservatives to get on board and support good legislation. There is a lot of it.

To the member for Regina—Lewvan, I sure hope to have that debate, maybe in December. I would be happy to help organize something for December or January. Hopefully, he will show up.

• (1605)

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite extols the virtue of the food program and how many meals it provides, but his own officials in his own department, in reply to a question, said there was no final data on the program results for 2025 because they are not yet available.

Why is he misleading this House and Canadians?

The Deputy Speaker: The member cannot say that a member is misleading this House in this chamber. I would invite the member to retract that statement.

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I will retract that statement and ask why the member said that.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, oh, what games the member is up to. I will tell her directly that the food program exists. Children are being fed. Contrary to the Conservative Party, the Government of Canada supports the children of Canada.

This is incorporated into the budget, and I sure wish the members opposite understood the program, supported the program and abandoned the leader of the Conservative Party's approach of not supporting the program.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for York—Durham, Housing; the hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City, Finance; the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Mental Health and Addictions.

[*English*]

I hear members still engaging in debate and suggesting words the parliamentary secretary should have used during questions and comments, but that time is now over.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Thornhill.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to split my time.

The Deputy Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent to split the member's time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, there are three things that are assured in life: death, taxes and a Liberal government that breaks its promises.

Six months ago, the Liberals stood here and told Canadians to trust them just one more time. They promised lower spending, lower costs and to reduce the size and scope of the federal government. They said that they had heard Canadians loud and clear, that they finally understood the pain they had caused, like a toxic ex, and that things this time would be different. Every single one of those promises, like their record, is nothing but total and utter failure.

The House passed a budget with a record \$78-billion deficit. That is more than twice the size of the one Justin Trudeau wanted to run years ago. That is not a tiny change. It is not a rounding error. It is billions and billions of dollars. If anybody thinks the Liberals are going to stop at \$78 billion, I have a bridge to sell them, and I think the Parliamentary Budget Officer would also have something to say to it. In fact, he said the chances of their out-of-control spending being less than \$78 billion was “less than 10%”.

If someone told a person there was a less than 10% chance of them being able to start their car in the morning, they would get a new car. If there was a less than 10% chance that someone would pass a math test, they would get a tutor. When we learn that the chances are less than 10% that the government will show just a bit of fiscal restraint or fiscal discipline, the Liberals will tell the Parliamentary Budget Officer he is likely going to be out of a job for telling the truth.

Here is what else he had to say, just so I can remind everybody watching. The spending is “shocking”, “stupefying” and “unsustainable”. He is a neutral, non-partisan appointee of this place. His office was put in by this very government.

The government is dropping \$90 billion in new spending on the books, which is over \$5,000 for every single household in Canada. That is money being taken directly out of the pockets of Canadian families and seniors through higher taxes, inflation and interest rates.

Why should we talk about that? We already spend more on the debt than this country spends on transfers to the provinces for health care. It is every dollar that is collected in GST. This means that every dollar collected on the sales tax in this country does not go to doctors, nurses or hospital capacity, but to bankers and bondholders to pay for the Liberals' addiction to spending.

If people think Justin Trudeau's continuing gift to them and their families is fiscal responsibility, the Prime Minister should say, “Hold my beer.” We keep paying for his irresponsible spending at \$5,000 a pop per household. It is only going to get worse. The Prime Minister and his finance minister continue to run debt on the taxpayers' credit card. They are effectively sinking the next generation.

I will have much more to say about the budget, because I think it is wrong and dangerous for so many reasons, but we are here today to continue the debate on affordability.

Let us talk about what the government is doing on affordability, or, rather, what the government is doing to affordability. All we have to look at is the lineups at food banks in every major city and every small town. Two million people in this country are now visiting a food bank every single month. There are four million people in Toronto going to a food bank in the span of one year alone. One in five people is now skipping meals to make their food last longer.

It is not just about numbers; it is about the people behind the numbers. It is about the kid who goes to school every single day on an empty stomach who cannot learn and grow. It is about the college-educated worker who, despite working a full-time job, still finds themselves at the end of the month with not enough to pay the bills. It is about the senior citizen who, after years of sacrificing and saving, has to make the choice between heating their home or having a hot lunch. These are the stories we hear in our neighbourhoods every single day. All this is happening in Canada. This country is supposed to be one of the richest in the world.

The Prime Minister's response is the most troubling, because it is not compassionate. For him, inflation is something that happens to other people.

Government Orders

• (1610)

The response from Ottawa has been textbook on this: It is another government program, with some form or version of central planning, that will make this problem go away. However, it is not actually solving the problem. It is more spending. This is a central bank economist who somehow missed the class that would teach him that an increase in money supply in this country leads to inflation. Whatever the Liberals want to call it, it is spending. Whether they call it investment or any other name does not matter. It is the same thing. It costs every single family more than five grand in this country for the small amount of tax cut they get. Members can believe that we are not going to stand here and oppose a tax cut, but if the government is giving somebody a small tax cut and on the other end charging them \$5,000 for its irresponsible spending, Canadians are going to have a lot of questions. That is exactly why we are here.

One plus one never equals two with the government. It is keeping in place such things as the Liberal taxes on food that make life more expensive while denying they exist. Only Liberals would deny that there is an industrial carbon tax on a farmer who grows food. Only Liberals would deny that there is a fuel standard on a trucker who ships food. Only Liberals would deny that there is a packaging tax on the people who sell food. Only Liberals would stand in this House every single day and deny that the person who is buying food is now paying more for it because of their taxes.

The Liberals say they are going to cut taxes in the bill, but we have to read the fine print. The tax cut adds up to \$90 a month in savings for an average Canadian, but the more than \$5,000 they are going to be spending because of the irresponsible budget really wipes out that \$90 a month. The question is, who really comes out on top?

When someone goes to a casino in Las Vegas, and I am sure there are some people who are watching at home who have been to a casino in Las Vegas, the house always wins. Eventually, the house wins. When one lives in Canada, it is starting to feel as though the government always wins and Canadians always lose, because the \$90 it gives them a month is entirely wiped out by the irresponsible inflationary spending of the massive deficits it is running, deficits it promised it would keep down \$16 billion less than what it put on the table, deficits that are bigger than Justin Trudeau's deficits, deficits that are the biggest in this country other than during COVID.

Instead of more of this, the bait and switch that we continue to see, here is what I think common sense would dictate we should do: Let us cut income taxes for real, not by \$90, but by hundreds of dollars a year per Canadian, by thousands of dollars a year for every Canadian, so that families can actually get relief and get ahead. Let us cut taxes on homebuilding so that young people can finally afford a home in this country. Let us cut the carbon tax in all its forms: the industrial carbon tax, the hidden taxes on food, the plastics ban and the fuel standard, which make the growing, shipping and selling of food more expensive.

Let us cut all those taxes. Let us not say that these taxes are imaginary, because millions of families across the country know that Canadians are paying more this year than last year and paid

more last year than the year before. These are Canadians who have been to a grocery store in their neighbourhood, which the Prime Minister has not. That is a shame in this country, because it is the Liberals' taxes that are increasing the price of food.

Every Canadian who cannot make ends meet right now should know that their tax dollars are being spent responsibly in Ottawa. The government does not have money. It can only tax us to get more of it. When it spends it irresponsibly, it is going to cost Canadian families more than \$5,000 a year. Everybody should know that.

• (1615)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some attention to the member's speech. I wonder how someone from the Conservative Party could vote against a bill that reduces middle-income taxes for 22 million Canadians. How is that possible? In her speech, she said she wants taxes to be removed on new homes for new buyers, and that is exactly what the bill does. How is it possible that she would vote against such a bill?

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, they needed us to get to this point in the debate.

I do not know if the member is new here, but we would never, never oppose tax cuts. What we are saying, though, is that the \$90 they are giving Canadians is wiped out immediately by the \$5,000 they are piling on every single Canadian family. I am not sure how the member sits with the government and votes for that.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois fully supports part 2 of the bill, but when it comes to measures like the GST exemption for first-time homebuyers, we think that it does not go far enough.

We know that saving for a down payment is one of the biggest barriers to accessing home ownership. Obviously, there is also the fact that rent and housing prices have skyrocketed and that it is hard to save up.

The Bloc Québécois made two specific proposals. The first proposal was to allow parents to cash out their RRSPs and to put that towards the home buyers' plan for their children. This is a zero-cost measure. The second proposal was to provide an interest-free loan for first-time homebuyers. This would cost next to nothing.

I would like to know what my hon. colleague thinks about those measures.

[*English*]

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say it used to be that home ownership in this country was not a distant dream for many Canadians. Today, eight out of nine young people do not believe they will ever own a home in this country.

Government Orders

We brought forward solutions in the Conservative platform, and the Liberals made some promises on housing. They delivered one out of the three promises, and probably the one that affects homebuyers the least. Their solution to housing in this country is to build yet a fourth bureaucracy, at \$13 billion, to build even fewer homes than we have had in this country.

Housing starts in every single city are down this month, and year over year, they will continue to go down because of more bureaucracy and fewer tax cuts on housing.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am sure, like my colleague and friend, many of us were back in our ridings last week talking to people. Affordability comes up in almost every conversation, whether it is about the cost at the grocery store, the cost of rent or the cost of filling our tank. I wonder if the Liberals are not getting that same feedback or are just out of touch.

When I talk to people at the grocery store, they literally look at stuff on the shelf and have to put it back because they do not have enough money left at the end of the month. The paycheques are not going as far as they used to. Also, we have seen that Canada went from 7th to 25th in the world when it comes to the quality of life index. Everything has become worse over the last 10 years. This was not the case before 2015, and it will not be the case after.

Does my colleague have feedback from the constituents in her riding from this past week?

● (1620)

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to test this out. I was at home in my riding, and like a lot of my other colleagues, I hear the same questions about affordability and the fact that Canadians are just getting sacked with higher grocery prices and higher prices on homes and gas, so I tried an experiment.

I went to a grocery store in a riding right next door to mine that is represented by a Liberal, and lo and behold, I heard the exact same conversations. People in that grocery store came up to me and they also told me about the taxes on food, the unaffordable housing, gas, groceries and home heating. It turns out that the Liberals are hearing that from their constituents. It is just that they are not doing anything about it.

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-4 and to the growing affordability crisis gripping Canadians from coast to coast. Nowhere is it felt more sharply than in my own riding of Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee. The bill fails to meet the moment, as so many introduced by the Liberal government do. It offers slogans instead of solutions and bureaucracy instead of hope.

While Ottawa debates, Canadian families are being forced to make choices that no one in a country as rich in resources as Canada should ever have to make, choices between heating their home and feeding their children. In the Okanagan, Lumby, Nakusp and the Slocan Valley, I have spoken with parents who quietly started skipping meals so that their kids can eat. Seniors who worked their entire lives are now relying on food banks. For the first time ever, food banks in our communities are reporting record numbers of working families, people with jobs needing help just to get by.

This is not the Canada they were promised. The data is as stark as it is shameful. Food inflation in Canada is rising faster than in nearly every other G7 nation. While the United States, France and Germany have all seen food price growth start to level off, Canadian families are still paying more every single month. According to Statistics Canada, grocery prices have risen more than 20% since 2020. That is hundreds of dollars a month for the average family, yet the government continues to tax the very farmers and truckers who bring food to our table. It has tripled the carbon tax, which adds cost to every stage of the food supply chain, from the fertilizer on the farm to the fuel in the trucks and the power in the grocery store. The result is higher prices on every item in the shopping cart.

With Bill C-4, the government wants to expand bureaucracy and regulatory oversight at a time when Canadians are begging for economic relief, not more red tape.

Let us be clear about what this means for real families in my riding. In Armstrong, dozens of workers at Tolko Armstrong lumber and White Valley veneer were recently laid off. These are hard-working men and women, millwrights and forklift operators, all dedicated to a proud local industry.

Tolko's statement was clear. They are not shutting down because of a lack of markets. They are shutting down because of a lack of economical fibre and because regulatory policy has made it nearly impossible to compete. The situation is made worse by the softwood lumber tariffs still imposed by the United States, tariffs that the Liberal government has utterly failed to resolve. Those illegal tariffs have cost Canadian producers more than \$8 billion in duty since 2017. This money could have gone to keeping mills open, workers employed and the community stable.

Instead, it has been siphoned away by an apparently unsolvable trade dispute that the government treats as an afterthought. To make matters worse, the folks who were laid off continue to be penalized by higher prices on the food they can no longer afford, prices that are directly attributable to Liberal actions.

Canadians deserve a government that stands up for forestry families in the North Okanagan and not one that leaves them behind. They deserve a government that protects our farmers and food producers, not one that taxes them into insolvency and treats their property like its own.

Government Orders

Canadians deserve a government that recognizes that affordability is not just an abstract policy. It is about whether a mother can afford milk for her kids, whether a senior can keep the heat on or whether a young couple can ever hope to buy a home.

The answer is not another bill that expands government reach. The answer is to restore economic discipline, to stop wasteful spending and to remove barriers to growth in every region of the country. It means fighting to end the softwood lumber tariffs once and for all, through strong, principled diplomacy backed by a government that actually defends Canadian workers. It means repealing the hidden industrial carbon tax that drives up prices on everything every single step of the way. In the end, the debate is not about partisanship. It is about priorities.

In Lumby, one father told me that he has been working two jobs since his forestry layoff but still cannot afford groceries and rent in the same month. This is the absurd cycle of Liberal economic policy: tax more, regulate more and make life more expensive for those who can least afford it, then add insult to injury by boasting about its handouts.

Bill C-4 was presented as a step toward making life more affordable, but, buried beneath the talking points, what we actually find is yet another expansion of government control, yet another layer of Ottawa intervention that would do nothing to lower grocery bills or pay the rent.

• (1625)

Instead of addressing the real drivers of inflation, which are overspending, overtaxation and over-regulation, the government keeps pretending it can spend its way out of the crisis it created by overspending in the first place. Let us remember that inflation did not just happen in Canada; it was made in Canada. It was made by a government that printed and borrowed half a trillion dollars, and then denied that it would cause inflation.

While ordinary Canadians tightened their belts, the government expanded its own. It increased the size of the public service by nearly 40% since 2015, yet federal services have never been slower. Passports, veteran benefits, EI claims and everything else takes longer and costs more, and the staff back in my riding can attest to that.

Canadians deserve better than this endless cycle of spending, taxing and gaslighting. They deserve leadership that believes in the strength of our workers, the promise of our industries and the common sense of the Canadian people. Do we believe in empowering Canadians to build, grow and thrive, or do we believe that Ottawa always knows best?

My constituents have made their answer clear. They want a government that gets out of the way, lets them work and lets them keep more of what they earn. They want affordable food, secure jobs and a future worth staying here in Canada for. Bill C-4 does not deliver that.

It is time for the government to stop managing decline and start building prosperity for the forestry workers in Lumby, for the families lining up at food banks in Vernon and for every Canadian who still believes that hard work should pay off.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the member, I get the impression he is voting against the legislation, so maybe he can provide some clarification on whether he supports Bill C-4. I would be very interested in knowing that.

On another note, I recognize that many of the concerns he raised are about supporting Canadians. We recognize that there is an affordability crisis, and that is why we have things such as the national school food program for children; the dental program, which helps seniors and others; and a national pharmacare program. We also continue to increase things such as GIS and OAS.

Can the member provide his thoughts? Does he support those types of increases and those programs?

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite seems to be missing the point, like so many Liberals. It would be lovely for every citizen of Canada to go to Disneyland once a year, but the trouble is that it costs money, so we have to be a little careful about what we do. Sure, we can do that.

If I give someone \$90 and then send them an invoice for over \$5,000, does that make any sense? Is that economically viable? I would suggest to the member that it is not economically viable and we have to be a bit more careful about where we are sending our trillions of dollars.

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for the words of wisdom in his speech.

If the government actually acknowledged that the taxes it has on food are not imaginary, and these are taxes such as the food packaging tax and the fuel standard, and if the government cut taxes in a real, tangible way that Canadians could feel, what would constituents in his riding be able to do with that extra money of their own in their pockets?

• (1630)

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, they would be able to feed their own kids, for one thing. They would be able to afford the basic necessities of life that they can no longer afford. We would reduce inflation, and we would make their dollars have more spending power. We have had decades of prosperity in Canada and we had it right up until 2015 when the government took charge.

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, how does the hon. member reconcile his claim of this effect of inflation on our industrial carbon pricing when the Bank of Canada and the Institute for Research on Public Policy have stated specifically that this will have an effect of no more than 0.15% to, at most, 0.5% on inflation. Is the member honestly claiming that this 0.5%, at most, is making food unaffordable?

Government Orders

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is looking at a mountain and talking about a rock at the foot of it. It has a cumulative effect when this Liberal government continually piles on Canadians, and then it adds insult to injury by over-regulating them on top of it.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I understand that my hon. colleague has little or no interest in measures to fight climate change. The Conservatives do not want a carbon tax. Pollution should be free. That is fine. His colleagues have the right to think that.

However, does my colleague agree that, in the midst of the election campaign, the government took \$814 million from Quebeckers to send election cheques everywhere outside Quebec to essentially buy votes?

We are calling on the government to return the \$814 million that was stolen from Quebeckers. Does the member agree with us?

[English]

Scott Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I would think the member would prefer to stay on the topic of Bill C-4 and not address side claims that have nothing to do with it.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a way, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-4 at third reading today. This bill was introduced at the beginning of this Parliament and was left untouched all summer. When we returned in the fall, we spent a lot of time reworking the bill in committee. I will explain later, but this is one of the bills where the fact that the Bloc Québécois holds the balance of power in committee was a boon for first-time homebuyers.

Let us start with the genesis of this bill. This year's election campaign was pretty odd. We had a Prime Minister who did not know what he was talking about when it came to economics. I know that the Prime Minister is an economist, but he quickly turned into a politician. I am a politician too. There is not necessarily anything wrong with that, but being a Liberal politician is not always a good thing.

This Prime Minister saw that people were afraid of the Conservatives and that President Trump was making threats, so he decided he would say whatever it took to get elected, without any regard for the budgetary consequences. It was in that context that the current Prime Minister announced in January or February that he would eliminate the deficit.

Then he walked into a room, probably a back room somewhere, and the people around him told him that it was not going to happen. Instead, he decided to invent a new definition of operating deficit. His definition is disputed by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, does not align with how things are done in Singapore or Great Britain, and violates established accounting principles, but he decided to invent it in order to renege on his promise.

The same is true of the Liberals' budget framework during the election campaign. The Prime Minister said that the countertariffs would bring in \$20 billion, that that money would be used to fi-

nance current spending and that this would help reduce deficits. We know that, in the end, the government received only a fraction of that amount in countertariffs. As a result, we are now facing a projected deficit of almost \$80 billion.

If we are to believe most analysts, including the Parliamentary Budget Officer and Fitch Ratings, who believe that the government will not be able to achieve \$50 billion in cost reductions over five years, the deficit is going to be even larger.

Despite this, despite the fact that the Liberal Party was unable to table a halfway decent financial framework, which we rather successfully picked apart during the election campaign, Bill C-4 includes election promises that were hastily made by the Prime Minister whenever he wanted to grab a vote from the left or the right.

Let us talk about the \$26-billion tax cut over five years. A tax cut could be a good thing. It is okay to take care of the middle class. However, when do we see a tax cut like that without a budget, without a budget forecast and without any regard for the impact this will have on balancing public finances? What is more, there was no mention of what exactly would be cut. Everyone now knows that health care and seniors are paying the price. It is the carbon tax.

The Liberals, who were the champions of the carbon tax in the last Parliament, aggressively criticized the Conservatives for wanting to abolish the carbon tax. Suddenly, during the election campaign, the Liberals decided that votes, seats and power were more important than principles, the planet, the environment and, above all, their credibility, so they got rid of the carbon tax while stealing from Quebec. That is what is in Bill C-4.

We do agree with some of the measures, particularly the GST rebate for first-time buyers purchasing a new home. However, this was essentially an election stunt and should be viewed as such. First, there is the GST rebate on a new first home. It is important to understand that this measure is designed to stimulate demand, much like the tax-free first home savings account, or FHSA.

The Liberals have been saying for several years that housing prices are going up and up. Construction costs are up. Demand has also gone up a lot. Today, we know that there is also an element that is related to immigration, the population and demand. The Liberals decided to help first-time homebuyers, who are angry about the current market, so they can have the money to outbid others using a tax shelter. That is why they created the FHSA.

According to CMHC data, the FHSA allows a person, such as a young person whose father, mother, grandfather or grandmother has money to help them contribute to an FHSA, to go fuel bidding wars in the housing market, because the supply of houses is fixed in the very short term. The result is that people are fighting for the same houses.

Government Orders

• (1635)

Today, there is another measure that is very similar, and that is the GST rebate. New homes very quickly come up for sale in new subdivisions. There are people who can afford the down payment on very expensive homes. In my riding, there are now bungalows that cost almost \$1 million. I know that in places like Vancouver or around Toronto, that is still considered affordable by some people's definition, but people back home cannot afford that. If these people get GST rebates on a new home because they are first-time homebuyers or because they have not owned a home in four years, that is a good thing.

The Liberals are accusing us of voting against the budget, even though we told them our priorities. The Bloc Québécois made six demands that were affordable, all things considered. These six demands had to be met in order for the Bloc Québécois to support the budget. One of our proposals was aimed at helping first-time homebuyers who do not receive money from their parents, grandparents, aunts or uncles to fill their FHSA. This measure was intended for those who do not necessarily have an income that would allow them to maximize these accounts and who have not yet saved enough for a down payment to buy their first home and, by the same token, obtain a GST rebate.

We proposed an interest-free loan from the government to help these people finance their down payment. It was a measure that would have cost \$200 million or \$300 million for all of Canada, from coast to coast to coast. This measure would have cost the government about \$300 per year for every \$10,000 loan it granted for a down payment. We are talking here about the down payment, not the total price of the home. This measure would have ensured that the least fortunate were not left behind. The government said no.

Let us now come back to Bill C-4, which is another example of the fact that, at the time, the Prime Minister did not know the difference between a party leader, someone who campaigns, and a prime minister. On March 20, when he was Prime Minister, he issued a press release saying that the government was going to refund the GST on new homes for first-time homebuyers. Some people started buying new homes. They thought it might be a good idea to buy a house in a new subdivision. People bought houses and signed contracts. They thought they were going to get their rebate because the Prime Minister had said they would. This was not announced during the election campaign, and the Prime Minister had said it himself. Then the Prime Minister called an election and launched his election campaign. He put on a show for 36 days and then recalled Parliament. All of a sudden, people were being told that the GST rebate would only be available to people who had signed contracts on or after May 28.

Everyone who believed the Prime Minister because he was the Prime Minister, everyone who thought this man had a modicum of integrity and principles and who signed a contract to buy a home, were not eligible for the rebate. We heard from representatives from the Ontario Home Builders Association. They told us that many people were in this situation. We also heard from representatives of the Association des professionnels de la construction et de l'habitation du Québec, or the APCHQ. They told us that many of their clients were in this situation.

At the Standing Committee on Finance, we proposed an amendment to move up the date for the GST rebate on new homes so that it could also apply to these people. How did the government respond? It responded by filibustering. There was opposition from the parliamentary secretary to the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, who is also known as the Minister of Finance. I do not think that he makes many decisions in the current government. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance was opposed to including these people who were trusting enough to believe the word of the Prime Minister of Canada. The Liberals refused.

At that point, in committee, the legislative clerks had found our amendments to be in order. However, the government tried to convince the committee chair that the bill could not even be amended to bring it into line with the Prime Minister's words. The chair accepted the government's arguments and our amendments were rejected. Thankfully, the Bloc Québécois holds the balance of power on the Standing Committee on Finance. We overturned the decision of the chair of the Standing Committee on Finance not once, not twice, not five times, not eight times, but eleven times.

Eventually, we came back here to the House to plead the case of the first-time homebuyers who had been cheated by the Liberal government. The Speaker of the House told us that we were right and that the chair of the Standing Committee on Finance was wrong. With that we scored a victory for first-time homebuyers in Quebec and in the provinces. This is a victory for Quebec.

• (1640)

This is another example of how the Liberals operate. They make promises before the election, they get elected, and then they give as little as possible and tell people to deal with their own issues if they were naive enough to believe them. That is exactly what happened.

Now, let us talk about the other part of the bill regarding the tax cut. The tax cut will cost \$26 billion over five years. Funnily enough, the Liberals are offering a tax cut of \$26 billion over five years while running a deficit of at least \$78 billion. We should come back to this again in a year, because the deficit could be \$5 billion, \$6 billion, \$7 billion, \$8 billion or \$10 billion higher. To them, \$26 billion is not a lot of money. However, when the Bloc Québécois said that we had reasonable demands for the budget, the government told us that it was too expensive.

The Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, who I assume knows how to count, was so determined to show that our budget demands were unreasonable that he multiplied them by five so he could say that we were asking for too much. We had submitted demands totalling \$6.6 billion. What we were asking for was half a percentage point of GDP. It is next to nothing.

Government Orders

We were asking for a program for first-time homebuyers, the program I mentioned earlier. We were asking for an investment of \$1.4 billion per year for social housing because, generally speaking, Quebec does not receive its share of funding from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation programs. These programs are designed for high-rise residential buildings, whereas Quebec's housing stock consists mainly of small multiplexes and buildings with five stories or less, made up of five, six or eight units. This would also have been a program for social and community housing, because there is one province in Canada that has permanent programs for the construction of social, community and co-operative housing: Quebec.

We therefore requested our share of a separate program, the rapid housing initiative, which amounted to \$1.4 billion. Old age security benefits for seniors amounted to \$3.18 billion. With regard to health care transfers, we were essentially asking that the amounts provided for in the temporary agreements under the Trudeau government be renewed, since they were expiring. That represented \$6.6 billion. Apparently that was too much. This tax cut alone would have paid for the Bloc Québécois's requests within five years, but our demands were too expensive.

Worse yet, the tax cut is an ill-conceived, poorly thought-out election ploy. It is a fairly small tax cut. According to figures from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, which I am quoting from memory, we are talking about an average of approximately \$180 per person in Canada. With the cost of housing and groceries rising, that is clearly not enough to keep people afloat. However, for 60,000 people in Canada, this is a tax increase. Who are those people? They are the most vulnerable people, including people with disabilities.

Canada has something called the disability tax credit. This tax credit is calculated based on the tax rate applicable to the same bracket, which has been reduced. When the tax rate on the first personal income tax bracket is lowered, the tax credit is lowered. It is a refundable tax credit. People with a disability who are too poor and who sometimes do not even pay personal income tax because they are in such a difficult situation were losing money. We are talking about 60,000 people.

Did the government think about those people? No, it did not. The Bloc Québécois did. The Conservatives also worked with these groups, who came to us and said they had not received a response from the government. The government told them that there was nothing it could do, that this is how tax credits are calculated. We are talking about 60,000 people.

These people did not benefit from an \$180 tax cut. For a single person, it is more like a loss of \$141. For people with disabilities who do not pay income tax, the government's tax cut increased their taxes by \$141, even though they are among the most vulnerable members of society. For a couple, we are talking about a loss of \$155, due to the form these tax credits take.

• (1645)

We had to prod the minister into announcing that he was going to try to find a solution. He ended up announcing it right out there in the foyer of the House before his appearance at the Standing Committee on Finance meeting, because he was afraid that his testimony might do him too much harm after he was confronted with all of

this. That is why holding the balance of power in committee is so important. That is what making gains looks like. It means giving genuine first-time homebuyers a real GST tax credit after the government let them down. It means ensuring that vulnerable people are not abandoned by the Department of Finance. Right now, we are studying the budget implementation act and, thanks to the Bloc Québécois's work with the groups that flagged this issue to us last spring, we know that the Department of Finance will look into this matter. We are confident of that.

The carbon tax is just one example among many of how this government is backpedalling on the environment. Just before he called the election, the Prime Minister decided to abolish the carbon tax because he did not want a carbon tax election, as the Conservatives wanted. This is how the mechanism worked. In provinces where the tax applied, the tax that would be paid later in the quarter was refunded upfront. It would be collected later. This was intended to make the mechanism socially acceptable when it was introduced. The government said it would send out the cheque first and collect the tax later. What did the Liberal government do? It abolished the tax. It never collected it for that quarter, and yet it still sent a rebate to people in seven provinces who had never paid it in the first place. The government still sent them cheques.

The government told us that we had a different pricing system in Quebec, and that was why we did not get a cheque. When it sent out those cheques with money from the government's consolidated revenue fund, 22% of which came from Quebec taxpayers, not one province, including Quebec, was paying a federal carbon tax. The move was denounced by a motion passed unanimously in the National Assembly of Quebec and by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, journalists and analysts. The only ones who thought the Earth was flat in this case were the Liberals. There are 42 Quebec Liberals here who claim that they are proud Quebecers and that they represent Quebec. How can they claim to represent Quebec when a Prime Minister from Ontario, who represents an Ontario riding, a parliamentary secretary from Winnipeg and a bunch of members from British Columbia tell them to vote against Quebec and they obey, despite the motion adopted by the 125 members of the National Assembly? That is exactly what happened, and it is just one example among many of how this government is backpedalling on climate action.

The last budget included \$4 million for the environment. I was at the budget lock-up with the member for Repentigny, and we were looking for the government's environmental policy. To pretend that they were investing money, the Liberals had to include critical minerals in that part. We are talking about \$4 million over five years for the environment. Now the government wants to go after the only thing left, the industrial carbon tax. It is funny that the Liberals want to go after this, because we heard from the Governor of the Bank of Canada at the Standing Committee on Finance.

Government Orders

The Conservatives said that everything produced by big businesses that would be hit with the industrial tax is expensive, including steel, and they produce materials that are used to build housing, so that would increase the tax on homes. The Governor of the Bank of Canada said that it had no effect on inflation and that we should look elsewhere to find the source of price increases, because these big businesses export their materials.

Bill C-4 is a mishmash of all sorts of things. We are obviously in favour of the part about housing, but how can anyone be in favour of a major environmental reversal that only served the Liberals' electoral interests? How can anyone support that? It is rather difficult. How can anyone unreservedly support a tax cut that ignores people with disabilities, that gives very little to households and that is ultimately being used to fund the cuts to health transfers that we saw in the last budget?

All I can say is that the government needs to stop introducing bills like this one, where everything and anything is all mixed together.

• (1650)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the good fortune of sitting in front of my esteemed colleague, who is an academic and economist by profession.

I was a little troubled by his comments on the possible role of a trained economist in politics. The current Prime Minister is a world-class economist. He was the governor of two central banks. I do not know of anyone else in the history of Canada, or perhaps anywhere else, who has done the same. This is someone who has had an international career and who knows how finance and economics work. My colleague seems to be saying that someone like that who enters politics is not a good politician by definition. I am a little confused, because he and I have somewhat similar backgrounds. We are not professional politicians. We have done other things in life.

Why would a trained economist not have a place as a politician in Canada?

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, members often say "esteemed colleague", but in this case, it is really true.

I think my colleague misunderstood what I said. The Prime Minister is an economist who has done great things. I have read his book *Values*. I have it at home. I even made notes in it. It is because of all the wonderful things he has said and written in the past that I am disappointed in his behaviour today.

The disappointment is proportional to the Prime Minister's previous values. I would love to believe that the member for Québec Centre has been true to his values throughout his political career. I want to believe that. One example is that he reinstated benefits for families in his first term. This is someone who came in and made political moves that were in line with what we can read about his academic career.

The Prime Minister is doing the exact opposite. He is someone for whom values are just a word and for whom everything else can be sacrificed on the altar of votes and power.

• (1655)

[*English*]

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member's speech highlights how dire the situation in our country has become over the past 10 years of Liberal government. The government seems to forget that there is only one taxpayer and that there is no such thing as government money. All the money the government spends comes off the backs of Canadians.

I would like to give the member an opportunity to explain why he thinks the government believes it is okay to spend Canadians' hard-earned money recklessly.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, we are all in opposition and usually, we rarely attack each other. My colleague is right on the first point. Ultimately, there is only one taxpayer. At the end of the day, the taxpayer gets all the tax bills. That is why we are calling for health transfers. That is why we think that the government should stop disengaging from health care funding and stop keeping the health transfer escalator at a level lower than system costs.

What happens at the end of all this? What happens is that Quebec and the provinces become unable to provide care and are forced to raise taxes, increase the debt and cut back on services. That is exactly what is happening. I do not mind the Conservatives being alarmist over the current situation, but we have been asking them for the past four years whether they want to see health transfers increased, so why have we never gotten an answer?

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his eloquent presentation.

He talked about the elimination of the carbon tax, which created a debt that has yet to be paid. The Quebec National Assembly roundly condemned this unpaid debt.

We both sat in the last Parliament. Members will recall that every time the Conservatives rose during question period, they said the government was going to "triple, triple, triple the carbon tax". They would not stop repeating that. Every time, the Liberals insisted that the carbon tax was fundamental, essential and necessary and that the future of the world depended on it.

Then, all of a sudden, the Liberals scrapped it. Can my colleague explain the shift in thinking that led them there?

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, it is because the Liberals became conservative to steal votes from the Conservative Party. It is true and it has been proven that the Liberal Party of Canada, which currently forms the government, stole \$814 million from Quebecers. It stole that money.

When the 42 Liberal members from Quebec tell us that they are standing up for Quebec, that is utterly false. They were not elected by Quebecers to steal from Quebecers. They took advantage of people's fear of Donald Trump so they could get elected and then said they were going to take \$814 million. That \$814 million is as much as the whole SAAQclic project cost.

Government Orders

It is more than what we are asking for in health transfers. It is three times the annual amount that the Prime Minister is going to spend in Quebec next year on hospital infrastructure. It is a lot of money that was stolen from Quebeckers.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I gather from his speech that my colleague from Mirabel believes it is important to be there for the people who need it the most.

Budget 2025 includes several measures such as automatic benefits to ensure that everyone who really needs federal benefits receives them. We made the national school food program and a tax credit for personal support workers permanent. However, when it came time to vote on this budget, our colleague voted against it. It is a bit like spending years calling for funding to extend the runway at the Magdalen Islands airport and then voting against that funding when it is granted.

My question for my colleague is as follows. Will he commit to voting for Bill C-4 this time? It includes a tax cut for the middle class and a GST rebate for first-time homebuyers, so it will truly help Canadians.

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, in my region, the now Liberal riding of Thérèse-De Blainville has lost 300 jobs at Paccar. What was the Liberal member's response? On October 23, at 7:36 a.m., on Mario Dumont's show, she suggested that these workers call community organizations and food banks, that they come up with a plan A, B or C, that they not take it personally, that they find another job, that they go back to school and that they go work somewhere else.

The government members rise, but they do not understand that, as members of the opposition, we cannot find fault with all 500 pages of a budget. That is why we set priorities and why we are consistent and transparent. That is why we submitted our priorities in advance. Rather than acknowledging that, they lecture us, even though they were the ones who said no to Quebec and turned their backs on our people. They go through their little shopping list, while one of their own tells people to go back to school even though the government has abandoned them.

I invite my colleague to take a good look at his party and acknowledge that it does not defend the interests of Quebeckers.

• (1700)

[*English*]

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was an impressive speech by my hon. colleague.

The budget will mean a \$78-billion deficit. This money is going to be borrowed against future generations, to be paid by Canadians for the longest time we can ever imagine.

What does the member think of the deficit? Should we go into a \$78-billion deficit with a budget?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, I think the federal government is borrowing money at Quebeckers' expense. If we look at the public debt of the average Quebecker, we see that the average Que-

becker owes nearly twice as much in federal debt as in Quebec debt. That is Canada's legacy to Quebeckers.

Now, will it be \$78 billion or \$79 billion? I think it could be more, because the government told us that it would find a way to cut spending by \$50 billion. It has identified \$10 billion in cuts, and maybe only half of that will be feasible. We saw in the budget lock-up that public servants do not even know what the government's plans are. They should have already found \$800 million to cut a month ago.

What worries me is the lack of transparency and planning and the fact that no one knows where we are going to be in three months' time with this government.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bloc members focus a lot of attention on the health care issue. During the nineties, there was a great debate inside the Manitoba legislature. What was raised, if not in the chamber, outside the chamber, was a tax-point shift that was agreed to with the provinces where cash was being replaced with tax points. That is one of the reasons the percentage is not as high as members opposite would maybe have liked to see. It was Jean Chrétien who established a guarantee in cash.

I am wondering if the member would not agree that having Canada contribute the cash, with record amounts of it today, is a positive thing for all of us.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North does not know what he is talking about. He is talking about the transfer levels, while we are talking about the discrepancy in the transfers. We are not talking about the level once tax points are taken into account; we are talking about the discrepancy. What we want the government to understand is that, if system costs increase by 6% but transfers only increase by 5%, the government is disengaging because of that discrepancy, regardless of the tax points or the level.

Maybe the Liberals should get their wages frozen for seven or eight years so they can understand what it feels like when the amount of money somebody receives does not grow at the same rate as the cost of living or the cost of providing services. We are not talking about the level of transfers, but the rate at which they increase. Starting with this year's amount, including tax points, if system costs increase by 6% and transfers increase by 5%, there will be a 1% difference that will build up over time, and that is very serious, whether my colleague is right or wrong about transfer levels and tax points.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Québec Centre.

Our new government was elected in the spring with a mandate to build a stronger, more resilient economy. We got straight to work from day one. I am thinking of all the investments we have made in housing and infrastructure that are going to stimulate the economy, the creation of the Major Projects Office or even the removal of interprovincial trade barriers. I am thinking of our buy Canadian policy, which will put the federal government's purchasing power to work for our businesses to once again stimulate our economy. I am thinking of all the agreements we are currently negotiating or have already signed with various countries around the world.

What is behind all this? In our desire to strengthen the Canadian economy, there is one principle that is very important to us: to ensure that the economy works for everyone. By making our economy stronger, we can fund measures that are important for making life more affordable for Canadians. Early in our mandate, we introduced Bill C-4 in the House, which includes three key measures that will have a real impact on people's lives.

First, we are proposing a tax cut for the middle class. The lowest tax bracket will have its tax rate reduced from 15% to 14%. This measure will benefit more than 22 million Canadians and will save each family up to \$840. That means more money in people's pockets that they can use for the things that matter to them.

The second important item in Bill C-4 is the GST rebate on new homes valued at \$1 million or less. We want to help Canadians become homeowners, whether they are young people, young families or long-time renters who want to get into the housing market and become homeowners. We want to help Canadians achieve this dream, and we want it to be affordable. That is why we are eliminating the GST on the purchase of a first home, on top of all the other housing measures we are putting in place. In budget 2025, we are investing over \$13 billion through Build Canada Homes to stimulate housing construction across the country, including affordable housing. In addition to everything we are doing through Build Canada Homes, we hope that removing the GST on the purchase of a first home will provide a financial incentive to buy a home and encourage property developers to increase the stock of available homes nationwide.

Finally, in Bill C-4, the government also announces that it is eliminating carbon pricing for consumers. When that was done on April 1, people very quickly saw prices drop at the pump, including in Madawaska—Restigouche, New Brunswick. It also had a tangible impact on heating costs in the Atlantic provinces, because many people there still use gas to heat their homes in the winter. I want to be clear: This in no way undermines our commitment to fighting climate change. Carbon pricing had unfortunately become a divisive and controversial policy. The fight against climate change is so important that we cannot afford to maintain a policy that overshadows all of our other climate efforts. One example I am thinking of is our climate competitiveness strategy, which was announced in the 2025 budget, as well as all the other measures we are putting in place.

What does this mean? It means that Bill C-4 is part of a series of measures that our government is implementing to help people cope with the rising cost of living. Budget 2025 includes several tangible measures. I am thinking of the fact that we have made Canada's national school food program permanent. This program ensures that

Government Orders

children start their day with a full stomach. Children want to have a productive day at school and want to learn, but they cannot do it an empty stomach. We understand this, and we are here for children across the country. An agreement has been signed with the Province of New Brunswick to expand the school food program to many schools, including some in my riding. I am thinking in particular of the Marie-Gaétane school in Kedgwick, which I graduated from several years ago. It benefits from this program, and so do several other schools in my riding. This is an essential program that is having a tangible impact on our children's lives. In budget 2025, we are making it permanent. We have also announced the introduction of automatic federal benefits.

● (1705)

We saw that there was a problem. Many people need and are entitled to federal benefits like the Canada child benefit, the Canada disability benefit and GST rebates. However, some of these people were not accessing the benefits to which they were entitled because they did not file their tax returns. A new measure will be implemented for automatic tax filing for people with low incomes and simple tax situations. This is a concrete measure to ensure that the system guarantees that the people who need federal benefits the most can access them.

We also announced a tax credit for personal support workers worth up to 5% of their earnings or \$1,100 per year. This is a concrete measure to help our personal support workers, who do essential work. These are the people who take care of our seniors. These are the people we call upon to take care of our parents and grandparents. They do essential work for Canadians, and we recognize that work. That is why, in budget 2025, we are proposing a tax credit to help them.

Government Orders

The Canada summer jobs program is another example. This program gives young people access to a job that could potentially help them pay for their education. The Canada summer jobs program often provides young people with their first work experience. In budget 2025, not only did we maintain funding for this program, we increased it. Last summer, I visited over 200 workplaces in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche. I can attest to this program's importance to the young people in my riding. We are also proposing plenty of other measures to help young people get jobs. For example, through budget 2025, we are going to invest \$300 million in the youth employment and skills strategy over the next two years.

It is very important to know that we made sure that budget 2025 would protect all the essential social programs that are helping Canadians cope with the cost of living. These include the Canada child benefit, which is received by more than six million parents across the country. This program transfers over \$40 million to my constituents to meet their children's needs.

We recently learned that more than five million Canadians are now enrolled in the Canadian dental care plan. This plan is having a real impact. I remember someone in my riding who told me she had dental issues. She simply could not afford to go to the dentist, and this situation had been going on for years. Because eligibility was expanded to all age groups in May, this person was able to access much-needed affordable dental care this summer. This is yet another example of a concrete measure that is improving people's lives.

We have also maintained our national affordable child care program, which benefits more than 900,000 children. On this side of the House, we understand that a strong Canada requires strong families. We have also maintained the Canada disability benefit, which helps more than 465,000 people across the country. We are also continuing with the Canada workers benefit, which benefits more than three million people.

All the other investments we are making in infrastructure can also have spin-offs that will help make the cost of living more affordable. I would like to give a concrete example of an announcement that was recently made in my riding regarding public transit. Last week, I had the opportunity to announce, on behalf of the Minister of Infrastructure and Housing, an investment of more than \$700,000 to expand public transit service in various communities in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche. This will give people in Vallée-des-Rivières, Grand Falls, Saint-Quentin, and Kedgwick access to flexible, affordable, high-quality public transit that is truly tailored to the needs of rural communities.

This is in addition to initial federal funding that made it possible to launch this service in the Edmundston region, in Madawaska. A person from Saint-Quentin will be able to travel to Edmundston for only \$5. This means seniors who do not have transportation will be able to visit their families or get to their medical appointments. Workers will be able to commute between their homes and their workplaces. Post-secondary students will be able to travel to the Edmundston campus of the Université de Moncton. This measure, this investment, will have a meaningful impact on the lives of families in Madawaska—Restigouche, as well as seniors, vulnerable individuals, and workers.

On this side of the House, when we talk about measures to help people cope with the cost of living, we follow up with concrete action. I look forward to voting in favour of Bill C-4 so it can pass and become law.

• (1710)

[English]

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I particularly listened when the member across the way talked about the carbon tax and all the conversation we heard about it prior to the election about how the carbon tax did not drive up the cost for Canadians and that, in fact, more money was going into their pockets.

I am curious if now the member is talking about how removing the carbon tax is driving the cost down, which we know is not really the case. Does he not now believe in the previous argument, or does he now agree the carbon tax did indeed drive up the cost of everything?

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague that the fight against climate change is both a moral and economic imperative. It is important to have a variety of measures in place to reduce our carbon footprint.

As for consumer carbon pricing, it is important to note that there was a rebate system. Yes, people paid a little more at the pump, but there was a rebate. As I mentioned in my speech, this policy had become controversial. It no longer had widespread support.

The fight against climate change is so important. We need to build a greater consensus among Canadians to really ensure that we implement ambitious climate measures that are tailored to the challenges of the day.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments, including his remark about the GST break on new homes. In my riding, however, the problem is that people are unable to save up enough money to buy a new home. Rents are rising and house prices keep going up, making the situation all the more difficult.

I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about our proposals for people who have not saved up a down payment yet. We have two proposals and both are simple. The first is to allow parents to use their RRSPs to help their children put together a down payment. The second is to offer interest-free government loans to help young people and new homebuyers with their down payment.

Government Orders

• (1715)

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis is real. There is a shortage of housing across the country, including in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche. When faced with a situation of this magnitude, the government must take action. Through the Build Canada Homes program, we will invest more than \$13 billion to stimulate housing construction across the country. Evidently, significantly increasing the number of available homes could put downward pressure on prices. It is a matter of supply and demand.

Funds will also be set aside for affordable housing through Build Canada Homes. Thanks to federal funding, we have already seen a lot of construction of this type of housing in my riding, in cities such as Edmundston and Campbellton. I have no doubt that with the investments we are making with Build Canada Homes, we will see more and more construction projects across the country, including in my riding.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed to hear my esteemed colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche say that last summer, he visited 200 places where people had found jobs through the Canada summer jobs program. I wish him good luck and lots of fun next summer, because the program is increasing the number of funded positions from 70,000 to 100,000.

What does he think about the impact this program is having on young people and community organizations in his riding?

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Canada summer jobs program is essential for our young people and for our small businesses and community organizations. Last summer, I visited day cares, summer camps, museums and festivals. I met people in public works and people who performed a variety of tasks. Without this program, their employers simply might not have been able to afford to hire them for the summer.

This provides our small businesses and community organizations with the tools they need and gives them access to a workforce during the summer. It also gives young people in our regions the opportunity to gain relevant work experience. Many of the young people I spoke with were gaining work experience for the first time. For others, it was experience related to their field of study. This program has a major impact.

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my Liberal colleague across the way. The student jobs with the Canada summer jobs program are interesting. However, when the government cuts 40,000 positions from the public service, even through attrition and voluntary departures, that means 40,000 fewer positions for young people who want to enter the labour market and have good union jobs as well.

What does he think of that?

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the various items will be carefully considered. We are definitely facing challenges right now. We had to invest in infrastructure, housing and all sorts of things.

We have allowed ourselves some flexibility. We are going to spend less so that we can invest more. We are going to invest over \$300 million in the new youth employment strategy.

[English]

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Bill C-4, the making life more affordable for Canadians act.

The bill would enact three important measures designed to make life more affordable for Canadians at a time when a range of economic headwinds are combining to pose significant affordability challenges. First, we would cut taxes for 22 million Canadians; second, we would eliminate the GST for most first-time homebuyers for new homes; and third, we would cancel the consumer carbon price while keeping industrial pricing regimes in place and, in fact, reinforcing them so we can make life more affordable for Canadians while tackling the existential challenge of climate change.

In a rapidly changing and uncertain world, Canada's government is focused on what we can control. We are protecting our communities and our country, we are building our economy with major projects and millions more homes, and we are empowering Canadians with lower costs and new opportunities to help them get ahead. Bill C-4 is part of our government's plan to ensure that every Canadian has more control over building their own future.

[Translation]

Bill C-4 would lower taxes for 22 million Canadians. In practical terms, this means that the tax rate on the first personal income tax bracket would drop from 15% to 14%. In 2025, this first tax bracket applies to the first \$57,375 of taxable income. For individuals whose taxable income is below that cut-off, their entire income tax will be reduced. The taxes of people whose income is above the cut-off will be reduced on the first \$57,375. In total, this represents a tax reduction of up to \$420 per taxpayer in 2026. For a family with two taxpayers, it would be up to \$840.

After the bill was introduced, the Canada Revenue Agency updated its source deduction tables for the second half of the 2025 tax year. That means the reduced tax rate is already in effect for many Canadians. Let me remind the House that the tax cut specified in the bill came into effect on July 1.

• (1720)

[English]

Ultimately, because the one percentage point cut in the lowest tax rate would come into effect halfway through the year, the full-year tax rate for 2025 would be 14.5%, while the full-year rate for 2026 and future tax years would be 14%. However, for that to happen, Bill C-4 must be passed. This is important support for Canadians. It is a very good reason to vote in favour of the bill.

Government Orders

Another good reason to vote for Bill C-4 is a GST rebate that would help Canadians access the housing market. Under the law, the GST generally applies to the sale of new or substantially renovated housing. Bill C-4 would eliminate the GST, or the federal portion of the HST, for first-time homebuyers on a new home valued up to \$1 million. It would also allow first-time homebuyers to reduce the amount of tax they pay on a new home valued between \$1 million and \$1.5 million.

The first-time homebuyers GST rebate included in Bill C-4 would save Canadians up to \$50,000 on a new home. It would allow more young people and families to enter the housing market. Moreover, this measure could incentivize first-time homebuyers to buy newly built homes. In turn, this increased demand would encourage developers to build more homes, which would have a positive effect on housing supply. Expanding the housing stock is indeed key to addressing housing affordability.

[Translation]

Canada has been in the midst of housing crisis for several years now. Our government has a plan to double the pace of residential construction over the next decade. Any policy that can contribute to that is welcome. There are others, such as Build Canada Homes, which is investing in and will invest in the renovation and construction of many social and deeply affordable housing units across the country.

[English]

The third thing Bill C-4 would do would be to remove the consumer carbon price from law following its cancellation back in April.

[Translation]

Large emitters will still be subject to pollution pricing, as that is an important and central pillar of Canada's plan to build both a strong economy and a greener future. Industrial carbon pricing systems encourage investment in technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Our government has been very clear. Pollution pricing for large emitters will remain a key part of our plan to build a strong economy and a greener economy.

In conclusion, the bill proposes three clear measures that will help Canadians in very concrete ways. First, there is a tax cut that will put more money in the pockets of Canadian workers, up to \$420 per taxpayer and up to \$840 for a family of two, impacting 22 million taxpayers across the country. Second, there is a GST rebate for first-time homebuyers purchasing a new home. This represents savings of up to \$50,000 on the initial cost of purchasing a new home to help first-time buyers and young people in particular enter the housing market. Third, there is the removal of consumer carbon pricing from law.

I urge all members of the House to vote in favour of this bill.

• (1725)

[English]

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am curious. The Liberal Party seems to be very excited about giving tax cuts and making things more affordable for Canadians. I wonder why it took the luxury tax off luxury vehicles but

continues to keep the HST and GST on health care services such as massage therapy.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the new member and obviously commend his important work. However, I would warn him about the things that previous members of the Conservative Party have done over the last few years.

The first thing Conservative MPs did in 2016 was vote against the middle-income tax cut at that time. Another thing that other Conservative MPs did, just a few years later, was to again vote against a middle-income tax cut. That was around 2020 or 2021. Therefore, I invite him to consider very carefully how he will vote on Bill C-4 so that future Conservative MPs can base their future votes on his soon-to-be-known behaviour.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is proud to talk about eliminating carbon pricing. I would remind the House that this was one of the marquee policies of this government, which boasted that 80% of people were receiving more money than they paid. The government scrapped it without putting any other measures in place.

Here is what interests me as a member from Quebec. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the fact that Quebec has its own system and that the federal government took \$814 million out of Quebecers' pockets to send vote-buying cheques to Canadians during the election campaign.

As a member from Quebec, does he agree with this decision to steal \$814 million directly out of Quebecers' pockets to send vote-buying cheques?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend knows very well what has taken place over the past few months. A payment was promised to all Canadians in the provinces that participated in the consumer carbon pricing regime, which did not apply to Quebec or British Columbia. The regime no longer exists. Therefore, the rebate does not exist either.

That has been very well understood, I think, by everyone who has been following the situation over the past few months.

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that as soon as he gets a chance, my colleague will travel around in his riding and speak with his constituents.

I have a two-part question.

First, what are people saying about all the programs he talked about? Second, in his view, what does the Leader of the Opposition think about the measures that we want to bring in for Canadians?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Beauport—Limoilou, who is now a Liberal member from the greater Quebec City area and who has increased the number of Liberal members from the greater Quebec City area by 50%.

It is not complicated. The Conservatives and the Bloc Québécois voted against the Canadian dental care plan and the Canada child benefit. On top of that, the Conservatives called the national school food plan wasteful and trash. They also voted against child care.

These are examples of measures that are very important to the people in my riding, and it is unfortunate to have to repeat once again that the Conservative members have systematically opposed them.

[English]

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question about the first-time homebuyer tax credit the Liberals are offering, which Conservatives loved because it was a part of our platform.

I am in the housing market. That is my background. I am wondering if the Liberals have given any thought, considering the cost of housing, as to how many young people this is actually going to help with getting into the housing market given the high price of construction in the current market.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's input, which suggests that she will vote in favour of Bill C-4 because she seems to be supporting the removal of GST on the purchase of new homes for first-time homebuyers. That is excellent news.

We look forward to confirming that vote soon in the House. It is great that she supports the measure, and we look forward to seeing that in the House through her vote.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved that Bill C-233, An Act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, for seconding this important bill.

It is with both a heavy heart and a deep sense of purpose that I rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-233, an act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, or what many civil society organizations have been calling the no more loopholes act, legislation that seeks to finally bring Canada's arms export regime into full compliance with the Arms Trade Treaty.

The bill is about something far larger than policy or procedure. It is about whether we, as a nation, will choose to be builders of peace or merchants of war. It is about whether Canadian-made weapons, the products of our factories, our labour and our infrastructure, will continue to fuel the killing of innocent civilians abroad.

We cannot claim to be one thing on the world stage, a supporter of human rights, while turning a wilfully blind eye to what we are

Private Members' Business

doing by maintaining this giant loophole. Canadians expect and deserve better.

Let me emphasize first and foremost that the legislation is not partisan. It should never be partisan. Every member of the House, regardless of political stripe, must ask themselves whether we want Canadian-made arms to be used to commit war crimes. Do we want our export laws to continue to contain loopholes so large that bombs and munitions slip through them? Do we want Canada's name to be associated with genocide and human suffering? The bill is our opportunity to say no, clearly, unequivocally and finally.

Canada acceded to the Arms Trade Treaty in 2019. The government did so with great fanfare, promising to uphold the highest standards of transparency, accountability and peace. Bill C-47 passed to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, establishing a new framework for arms brokering and export controls.

At the time, Canadians were told that our government was committed to ensuring that our weapons would never contribute to human rights abuses, that we were joining the world in saying never again to atrocities fuelled by the global arms trade. What we were not told, and what Canadians are now only beginning to understand, is that the 2019 amendments left open a gaping loophole, a loophole that has since become a giant and open back door for weapons, components and explosives to flow freely from Canada to the United States and then onward to some of the most brutal conflicts in the world.

The U.S. loophole is indeed the heart of the problem. Canada never adopted article 4, which required Canada to treat weapons, parts and components with the same scrutiny as full weapons systems. Canada also left out article 6, which clearly prohibits arms transfers where there is a serious risk that they will be used in genocide or war crimes. By omitting these articles, it means that, under section 7 of the Export and Import Permits Act, the lion's share of exports to the United States are exempt from the permit reporting and human rights risk assessment requirements that apply to every other country.

That means that Canadian-made weapons, explosives and parts can cross into the United States completely unmonitored, with no transparency and no public record. Once they arrive in the U.S., those components are often integrated into larger weapons systems, F-35 fighter jets, Apache helicopters and heavy munitions, and then exported to countries such as Israel, Saudi Arabia and Sudan, where they have been used to devastate civilian populations.

In fact, in 2009, under the Harper administration, General Dynamics Land Systems, a Canadian company, provided 724 light armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia. These light armoured vehicles were seen being used in Saudi Arabia's operations in Yemen for years, where hundreds of thousands of Yemenis were killed.

Private Members' Business

● (1735)

In 2014, under another contract, Canada supplied a newer make of armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia. In 2015, that continued under the Trudeau administration. This is not speculation; this is not hyperbole. This is fact, documented in commercial export data, defence contracts and investigative journalism.

A recent report by Arms Embargo Now uncovered that hundreds of shipments of Canadian military goods are directly contributing to atrocities abroad. Between April 2004 and August 2025 alone, 34 shipments of Canadian-made aircraft components went to Lockheed Martin in the United States. Later, those same components were transferred to the Israeli Ministry of Defense and Israeli weapons manufacturers. Another 360 shipments of Canadian aircraft parts went to the F-35 assembly facility in Fort Worth, Texas. These are the same F-35s that have been dropping bombs on Gaza. Meanwhile, 150 shipments of explosives from Quebec went to U.S. ammunition plants, producing 2,000 pounds of bombs and artillery shells exported to Israel.

This is not indirect complicity. This is active participation in a deadly supply chain. Let us be clear about what that means. When Canadian-made components end up in weapons that kill civilians in Gaza, when our explosives are part of the bombs that are dropped on hospitals and apartment buildings, Canadians bear responsibility. When weapons bearing the logo of a Canadian arms manufacturer have been documented in the hands of paramilitary groups in Sudan, groups accused of massacring civilians and committing ethnic cleansing, Canada is complicit.

The United Nations and human rights observers have warned repeatedly that the flow of arms, including those traced back to Canada, has fuelled one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world. We cannot continue to hide behind bureaucratic language or the convenient fiction that what leaves Canada for the United States stays in the U.S. It does not, and we all know it.

The government has tried to reassure Canadians. The former foreign affairs minister said that no Canadian “arms or parts of arms” were sent to Gaza. Her successor, the current foreign affairs minister, said that Canada would “not allow Canadian-made weapons to fuel this conflict in any way”. Those words ring hollow when confronted with the evidence.

The government has done nothing to close the U.S. loophole, nothing to stop the use of Canadian-made weapons or components in the bombardment of Gaza, nothing to ensure compliance with the Arms Trade Treaty. By exempting U.S.-bound exports from oversight, Canada is violating not just the spirit but the letter of the Arms Trade Treaty. Article 5 of the treaty requires all state parties to regulate arms transfers in a consistent, objective and non-discriminatory manner. Article 6 prohibits transfers that would contribute to genocide, crimes against humanity or serious violations of the Geneva Conventions. Article 7 requires each state to assess the risk of exported weapons being used to commit such acts.

When the government issued general export permit no. 47 in 2019, allowing the full export of full-system conventional arms to the U.S. without permits or risk assessments, it undermined the very treaty we acceded to. That was why we need to pass Bill

C-233, to end such blanket exemptions, so that Canada can finally live up to the promises we made to the world and to ourselves.

Bill C-233, the “no more loopholes act”, will close the U.S. export loophole requiring permits and human rights assessments for all military goods, regardless of destination; end the issuance of general export of brokering permits that bypass case-by-case review; ensure full transparency and public reporting of all military exports, including those to the U.S.; and reinforce Canada's compliance with the Arms Trade Treaty and restore integrity to our export regime.

● (1740)

A few weeks ago, I received a leaked document of the Liberals' talking points to counter my private member's bill. The Liberals say that Bill C-233 is misguided. They say this bill would decimate Canada's defence industry, that it would create unnecessary delays and potentially block Canada-made materials and equipment from getting to our allies in Europe like Ukraine, and that it would weaken Canada's role in NATO. Let me address each one of these points head-on.

First, living up to Canada's commitments to the Arms Trade Treaty is not misguided. It demonstrates the integrity and trustworthiness of a nation.

Second, the bill would not decimate the defence industry. It would simply require that all exports, including those going to the United States, meet the same human rights and risk assessment standards that we already apply to every other destination. If a country is already compliant with the Arms Trade Treaty, it has nothing to worry about. Canada's defence system will not be put in jeopardy, as Canada is reliant on imports of military goods going to Canada, not exports.

Third, this bill would not disrupt NATO or delay aid to Ukraine. Not only is there no evidence that it would delay or potentially block Canada's military aid to Ukraine, but the vast majority of the aid to Ukraine is sent either directly to Ukraine or to European allies. This bill seeks to standardize the regulatory process for arms exports going to the U.S. In addition, transfers of military aid, including for Ukraine, are handled by the Department of National Defence, not the export permitting process overseen by Global Affairs.

Fourth, harmonizing export controls with our European allies strengthens, not weakens, NATO. Of the 32 NATO members, 30 are state parties to the Arms Trade Treaty. The two states that are signatories to the Arms Trade Treaty but have not acceded to the treaty, are Turkey and the U.S. Passing Bill C-233 would, in fact, bring Canada into alignment with the vast majority of our allies, not out of step with them.

Some have bizarrely claimed that more transparency would compromise our sovereignty. Transparency is not a threat to sovereignty; it is its foundation. A sovereign nation should be able to stand before the world and say with confidence that its weapons are not being used to kill innocent civilians. This is not weakness; this is actually strength.

While I acknowledge that Canada's defence industry contributes to our economy, that economic benefit cannot come at the expense of human lives. Our message to the defence industry is clear: If exports are compliant with international law, business can continue; if exports risk enabling war crimes, then they must stop. We cannot and must not build prosperity on the backs of human suffering.

This is ultimately a test of our integrity, particularly at a time when there will be unprecedented defence spending with a commitment of \$81.8 billion in budget 2025, far exceeding the 2% NATO commitment the Prime Minister made during the campaign. We cannot continue to call for peace while profiting from war crimes, and we cannot condemn atrocities abroad while quietly enabling them through our exports.

Canada once led the world in peacekeeping. We once stood proudly as a voice of conscience on the global stage. However, today, our moral standing is being eroded, not by what we say but by what we permit. As we debate this bill, the bombs are still falling on Gaza. Families are still being buried beneath rubble. Children are dying in hospitals that are running out of fuel and medicine. Somewhere in the chain of destruction, there are Canadian-made parts, like propellants and circuitry, that help make these weapons possible. That must end.

History will judge us not by how we defended industries or alliances, but by whether we defended humanity. Bill C-233 is about closing the loopholes, yes, but it is also about opening our eyes. It is about aligning our laws with our values, our words, our deeds, our actions and our conscience, with no more exceptions, no more excuses and no more Canadian complicity in war crimes.

To my colleagues in this House, if we truly believe in human rights, in the rule of law and in peace, then we must support this bill. When the crime is the killing of innocent civilians, there can be no loopholes, no silence, no culture of impunity, no looking away, no wilful ignorance and no moral blindness.

• (1745)

Canadians will be watching how each member votes, and it will be recorded in Hansard forever. They want Canada to be a force for peace. It is time for us to live up to that promise.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for contributing to

Private Members' Business

the debate by raising these points. I am going to talk about this later, because I will be giving a speech on the topic, so I will not delve into it too deeply right now.

However, let us consider a hypothetical scenario, because I want to make sure I understand all the details. Daesh, in Iraq and Syria, has often stored arms or ammunition in hospitals, schools and mosques on the assumption that the Global Coalition Against Daesh would not dare attack such places. I want to make sure I understand correctly.

If the coalition were to attack such locations, which are in fact places where terrorists store arms, would export permits necessarily be suspended?

Could Canada continue to export to such countries?

[*English*]

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, with Canada's current commitment, the export of arms and weaponry to every other country has to go through a permitting process. That has to be measured against risk assessments and the standards outlined in the Arms Trade Treaty, except for the United States. The vast majority of the weaponry that goes to the United States does not require a permitting process. This is what we are talking about. We need to close the loophole to ensure that weaponry, parts and components that go through to the United States are measured against the Arms Trade Treaty, and that the standard applied to every other country applies to U.S. exports as well. In that way, we can be—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): We have to allow time for other questions.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed with this private member's bill. Essentially, what the member is trying to do is chase the defence industry right out of Canada and into the hands of Donald Trump.

Right now, the defence industry employs thousands of people right across this country. She talked about Saudi Arabia and the LAVs that are being built in London, Ontario, a riding that used to be held by an NDP member, Lindsay Mathysen. Of course, she is no longer here because of the NDP's lack of support for the labour sector. As we know, creating these thousands of jobs and having these companies here actually support Canada's sovereign capabilities to build weapons for ourselves. Those industries are not sustainable with just Canadian orders.

Why is she chasing jobs out of Canada and into the arms of Donald Trump?

Private Members' Business

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government continues to argue that Canada is not violating the Arms Trade Treaty. If that is the case, manufacturers here in Canada have nothing to worry about. All I am saying is that we need to make sure when we export to the United States that exports meet Arms Trade Treaty requirements so that we do not contribute our weaponry, parts and components to atrocities and to committing genocide and crimes against humanity. I do not think Canadians want blood on their hands, and that is what the bill would mean. If companies do not violate the act, there is nothing they need to worry about. It would not impact them at all.

[*Translation*]

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Vancouver East on this extremely important initiative.

Canada is also a signatory to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Because of the American loophole, which allows weapons to be sold to the United States and then end up in Israel, Canada could be complicit in genocide—

• (1750)

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I apologize for interrupting the hon. member. Some people seem to think they are in their living rooms right now, and it is very unpleasant.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Of course.

I will ask the hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie to start over and ask his question again.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Vancouver East on this important bill.

Canada is also a signatory to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. With the American loophole, which allows Canadian weapons to flow through the United States and then to be sold to the Netanyahu regime, does my colleague not think that Canada and the Liberal government could find themselves in a situation where they could be accused of being complicit in genocide?

[*English*]

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. We want Canadians to feel proud, and we want the Canadian government to take action so we can proudly stand on the international stage and say that Canada is not complicit, because as it stands right now, we are. Our arms, our components and our weaponry are ending up in some of the most brutal conflicts in this world, which are killing civilians using Canadian-made arms. That is wrong and has to stop.

I urge all members of the House to support Bill C-233.

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the member for Vancouver East for her ongoing and very steadfast commitment to strengthening oversight and to bringing peace in our world. She has attempted to do that in the bill, and I believe that all members of the House agree that Canada must

maintain a strong export control system to prevent the misuse of weapons anywhere and everywhere.

Right now, global security matters more than ever, and Canada must act with clarity and resolve. The decisions we make today in the House will shape not only our sovereignty but also the safety of Canadians and of our allies around the world. Accountability does matter, but Bill C-233 as it is drafted, while perhaps well-intentioned, would risk undermining Canada's security, international security, our defence industry and our international partnerships at a critical moment.

Indeed, since the Second World War, Canada has strengthened our export controls for arms to the point where we are privileged to have one of the world's strongest, strictest and soundest regimes. For generations, countries have looked to Canada as a leader, as a peacekeeper and as one of the world's most steadfast promoters of the responsible use and sale of military equipment. Canada's voice matters.

Canadians are wanted and needed to promote peace, to make peace and to keep peace. That is why a Liberal government under then foreign minister Lester Pearson ensured that Canada was there to found the United Nations Peacekeeping Forces. It was a Liberal government that made sure Canada was a founding member of the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies.

[*Translation*]

That is why the Liberal government ensured that Canada was one of the founding members of the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies.

[*English*]

It was a Liberal government under then foreign minister Lloyd Axworthy that shepherded the Ottawa convention to ratification, banning the practice and use of landmines. A Liberal government then ratified the Arms Trade Treaty in 2019.

Canada's efforts do not go unnoticed. When looking to refine their export control systems, other countries have looked to our own as one of the strongest and most effective examples. I know it has been many years, but I would remind the member for Vancouver East of the debate while she was an MP in 2018, respecting Bill C-47 during the 42nd Parliament. Canada had a strong debate about that and put in standards that not only meet the Arms Trade Treaty requirements but exceed them.

Private Members' Business

We apply exemptions more narrowly than any other ATT signatory does. We control a wider range of items than the ATT requires. Not only do we place controls on conventional arms; we also control dual-use goods and nuclear, chemical, biological and missile technologies. We impose a stricter criterion for denials than those specified under the ATT, such as where there is a risk of contributing to gender-based violence, terrorism or organized crime, and we enforce those rules. We enforce controls on Canadians involved in the transfers of military goods, even if the goods never enter Canada. We have tabled annual reports to Parliament on the export of ATT items ever since the 1990s, long before the ATT's ratification.

In deciding whether to issue or not issue an export permit, the current law dictates that it be taken into consideration whether the proposed export would contribute to peace and security, or undermine it, and whether it could be used to commit or facilitate a serious violation of international humanitarian law. We are very serious when we take these matters into consideration, and we are vigilant on the enforcement of the law; those who breach it are held accountable.

Suggesting that Canada is not compliant with the ATT is not only misleading; Canadians also both need and deserve to hear the truth about it. We have a comprehensive legal framework, a legislative framework, that we in Parliament have contributed to and that now the Government of Canada enforces.

• (1755)

Thus, we can see that Bill C-233, while based on good intentions about keeping people safe, is actually based on false premises. Canada has one of the strongest military export control systems in the world, and considerations for human rights are at its very core.

Instead of strengthening Canada's ability to promote responsible use and sale of military goods, this well-intentioned but misguided piece of legislation has wide-reaching implications, and it would have unintended consequences. We are working to fulfill our NATO commitments. We want to bolster security and defence industries. We want to diversify trading partners, and this bill would put us out of step with our allies in licensing efficiency, transparency and the use of appropriate discretion.

We are a NATO country. We need to be part of NATO, and the security of NATO is something that Canadians depend on. That does mean, for us in the House today, that we need to keep our NATO obligations and build upon them. This legislation would undermine that.

The changes proposed in the bill would severely hinder our defence industry by creating further instability. It would weaken Canada's role in NATO by creating unnecessary delays and potentially blocking Canadian-made materials and equipment from getting to our allies to keep our world safe, allies like Ukraine, and it would jeopardize the capabilities of our Canadian Armed Forces by constraining the way they get the supply of critical equipment and impeding their operations in vital regions like the Arctic.

Under Canada's existing export control framework, Canada allows certain military items to be exported without permits, provided they are destined for specific countries. This flexibility is em-

bedded in the systems of our closest allies, such as the U.K., the EU and Australia. We also have deep and symbolic relationships with other partners, such as the United States, and it is a party for which the ATT also provides certain exemptions. Canada already applies this discretion more narrowly than any of the other nations granting permit-free access to only one country.

• (1800)

Let me be perfectly clear. Any exemption that we provide the U.S. is not a loophole. It reflects a unique geopolitical relationship rooted in our shared security commitments, continental defence and decades of military integration. This legislation would undermine these efforts and make both of our countries less secure with greater threats to our sovereignty and our stability.

The bill's stringent permitting requirements would not only strain our relations with the United States and our co-operation, but also disrupt relationships around the world. Mandatory delays in approvals would place Canadian suppliers at competitive disadvantages in Europe and Oceania, while restrictive end-user requirements could hinder Canada's ability to support partners like Ukraine in a critical time.

Let me get to the heart of this. We are in a consequential moment for global security. We have had an election. Canadians have declared that our sovereignty and our security are paramount. We are serious. We call upon all parties in the House to take that consideration seriously to ensure that Canada can defend itself and can work with our NATO allies to defend ourselves in the world.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-233, an act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, was introduced by the member for Vancouver East. I would like to thank the hon. member for introducing this bill, as it allows us to highlight the role of the Export and Import Permits Act.

[*English*]

The bill would amend the Export and Import Permits Act, which governs Canada's defence and military exports, by removing exemptions for specific countries. Currently under the Export and Import Permits Act, the United States is exempt from its provisions, due to a ministerial order. This exemption allows the United States to re-export Canadian military exports without the Government of Canada's approval. The United States is the only country under the act that is currently granted this exemption.

Private Members' Business

The effect of the bill would be to bring the United States under the provisions of the Export and Import Permits Act by removing the power of the minister to grant exemptions such as the one that has been granted to the United States. This would result in an effective ban on Canadian defence exports to the United States if those exports were to be re-exported to another country on which Canada has implemented a defence export ban.

The bill would change the current legal framework by clarifying that parts, components and technology necessary for the assembly or use of arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war are included in the meaning of those terms. It would also change the legal framework by preventing exemptions to the export control list for arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war based on their country of destination.

The bill would change the legal framework by preventing the issuance of general export permits and general brokering permits for arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war; by expanding the list of considerations that the minister must take into account in issuing a permit to export or broker arms, implements, ammunition or munitions of war; and by providing that the minister must require end-use certificates from the government of a country to which these arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war are being exported if doing so would sufficiently mitigate a substantial risk of war crimes or violations of international humanitarian law or international human rights law.

Finally, the bill would change the current legal framework by requiring the minister to prepare and table in Parliament an annual report on the export of arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war and Canada's compliance with the Arms Trade Treaty.

The defence industrial sector in Canada in 2022 contributed \$14.3 billion to our GDP, which is roughly 0.5% of Canada's GDP. This sector is expected to grow substantially as a result of the government's commitment to massively increase Canada's military spending. Half of the production of Canada's defence industrial sector is exported, much of it to the United States, and herein lies the problem with the bill.

• (1805)

[*Translation*]

This bill could create some conflict between Canada and the United States. For example, the United States could view the passage of this bill as a significant threat to its defence and security. I would like to highlight one such example.

[*English*]

The United States military describes the F-35 fighter jet as an indispensable tool and a cornerstone of their fighter fleet, both for homeland defence and for warfare. Some of the F-35 parts are manufactured in the United States, but other parts of the F-35 are manufactured in Canada, with the final assembly of the F-35 in the United States in Fort Worth, Texas.

I would like to enumerate some of the F-35 parts that are manufactured in Canada, which my colleague across the way has highlighted. The horizontal tail assemblies for the F-35 are manufactured in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The weapons bay door inserts are

manufactured in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia. The engine sensors are manufactured in this city, the city of Ottawa in Ontario, and the out-board wing assemblies are manufactured in Delta, British Columbia.

One of the consequences of the bill is that it could result in a ban on F-35 parts manufactured in Canada being exported to the United States. It is not difficult to see how the United States would view this ban as a direct threat to their defence and security if Lockheed Martin's plant in Fort Worth, Texas, cannot complete the assembly of F-35 jets because of an inability of the company to import the necessary component parts from their plants in Canada.

Another consequence of the bill that I fear is a possible deintegration of the integrated North American defence industrial sector. Canada could see the exodus of thousands of good jobs from this country as defence industrial companies exit Canada to ensure access to the U.S. market. These are companies like L3 Harris Wescam in Hamilton, Ontario, which employs over 1,300 workers; Magellan Aerospace in Mississauga, Ontario, which employs over 600 workers; Honeywell, also in Mississauga, Ontario, which employs over 3,500 workers; General Dynamics Mission Systems—Canada in Ottawa, which employs over 1,000 workers; and Lockheed Martin Canada, which employs over 1,400 workers across multiple locations in Canada, such as Ottawa, Montreal, Calgary and Victoria.

[*Translation*]

For all these reasons, I do not support this bill.

[*English*]

I would again like to thank the member for Vancouver East for bringing the bill forward to allow this debate in the House to take place. However, again, for the reasons outlined, I do not support the bill.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, tonight we are debating Bill C-233, an act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, introduced by the member for Vancouver East.

I will begin by outlining the main points. Bill C-233 amends the Export and Import Permits Act to remove certain exemptions for the export of arms, ammunition and military or dual-use equipment.

The objectives of the bill are as follows:

- (a) clarifying that parts, components and technology necessary for the assembly or use of arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war are included in the meaning of those terms;
- (b) preventing exemptions from the Export Control List for arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war based on their country of destination;
- (c) preventing the issuance of general export permits for arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war;
- (d) preventing the issuance of general brokering permits for arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war;
- (e) enhancing the considerations that the Minister must take into account in issuing a permit to export or broker arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war;
- (f) providing that the Minister must require end-use certificates from the government of a country to which arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war are being exported if doing so would sufficiently mitigate a substantial risk of war crimes or violations of international humanitarian law or international human rights law; and
- (g) requiring the Minister to prepare and table in Parliament an annual report on the export of arms, ammunition, implements or munitions of war and Canada's compliance with the Arms Trade Treaty.

Obviously, the example that comes to mind today is the brutal Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I know that there are other examples, but this is the one we are going to use to illustrate certain points during our discussion. Let us not forget that the NDP, which is introducing this bill, and the Bloc Québécois were among the first to demand an end to arms sales to Israel. We still support that. Neither the NDP nor the Bloc Québécois has been shy about denouncing the crimes being committed by the Netanyahu administration in Palestine, whether in the past, present or possibly in the future.

The idea underlying the bill we are discussing is this: Even if everyone agrees on the need to stop selling weapons to a country that would misuse them, whether in Gaza or elsewhere, nothing currently stops a country from selling arms to a third country. A country could buy weapons from Canada and then resell them to another country officially boycotted by Canada. The example closest to home would be if the United States were to buy weapons from Canada and then ship them to Israel, making it appear as though Canada had sent weapons to Israel itself.

I want to start by saying that we support the intentions of Bill C-233. I also want to commend the member for Vancouver East on her constant efforts to promote world peace. This bill is a testament to her commitment to that. The bill is full of good intentions, but the Bloc Québécois has a number of concerns about some of its aspects.

Our first concern is that it is doubtful whether it will actually work, because the defence industries of the United States and Canada are extremely integrated. That is already quite a headache. Bill C-233 amends the Export and Import Permits Act to add restrictions. It eliminates the exemptions that were provided for under the act.

In addition, the bill would require U.S. importers to produce a certificate stating that the weapons or ammunition would not be used to commit any crimes. The intention is entirely commendable, but the addition of such constraints and the lack of predictability in the government's decision mean that American companies will simply seek out other suppliers to reduce the risk that their imports will be blocked by the Canadian government. In short, to use the example given, the Americans would stop buying weapons from Canada

Private Members' Business

but could continue to get them elsewhere and sell them to be used in Gaza anyway. We have no control over the choices the Americans make, and it is unrealistic to think that we have any kind of leverage over them.

● (1810)

Another problem with the bill is that the threshold for refusing an export is unclear. For example, the bill states that an export permit should be denied if there is a risk that a weapon could be used against civilians or civilian buildings. In that case, all exports to the United States would have to be halted, since there is always a risk—through negligence, through error or sometimes deliberately out of necessity, unfortunately—that civilians or buildings will be hit by a U.S. strike. Take the example of soldiers who disobey their rules of engagement and commit war crimes. The threshold set out in the bill is too vague, too arbitrary.

Here is what the bill says:

...where there is a substantial risk that they would be used to commit or facilitate genocide, crimes against humanity, grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, attacks directed against civilian objects or civilians protected as such or other war crimes as defined by international agreements to which Canada is a party;

While the threshold of “genocide” for denying an export permit is clear, the threshold of “attacks directed against civilian objects or civilians protected as such” is vague.

Let me give an example. In Iraq and Syria, Daesh terrorists frequently used mosques, schools or hospitals to store weapons and ammunition. Their reasoning was simple. If the global coalition avoided strikes on such locations, the weapons and ammunition would be safe. Conversely, if the coalition were to strike those places, other international bodies would condemn the attacks, undermining public support for military intervention in coalition countries. However, if I understand the spirit of Bill C-233 correctly, striking locations like schools and hospitals would immediately force Canada to halt its exports to coalition countries.

The Bloc Québécois thinks it would be better to leave this up to the government's discretion. Not only would it improve predictability, but it would allow for the possibility of putting pressure on other countries. For example, rather than following rigid rules, we would be able to threaten to halt exports to a country during negotiations and compel it to comply more strictly with international law. That discretion could give us a bargaining tool.

In short, the Bloc Québécois has serious reservations about Bill C-233, but we believe it is important to listen carefully to the two-hour debate on the issue. We will listen to all the arguments from all sides on this bill and then make a final decision on whether we should refer the bill to committee.

Private Members' Business

• (1815)

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the member for Vancouver East for introducing Bill C-233, an act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, as part of Private Members' Business.

I have heard many comments about this bill from people in my riding of Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester. It is clear that Canadians are deeply concerned about our country's role in global security and the responsible export of military equipment. The debate surrounding this bill touches on core Canadian values: our commitment to democracy, human rights, responsible trade and our contribution to making the world a safer place. These are not abstract ideals, but the very foundations of our foreign policy.

[English]

No one here disagrees with this bill in principle. Canada must maintain strong export controls to prevent the misuse of weapons. However, Bill C-233 rests upon a false premise.

Canada has one of the world's strongest export control regimes in the world and has updated it over the years accordingly. That is why Canada joined the Arms Trade Treaty in 2019 and updated our laws to ensure full compliance through Bill C-47, a bill that many members, including the member for Vancouver East, should remember well.

[Translation]

Canada's export control system aims to limit the illicit arms trade by preventing weapons from falling into the hands of terrorists, criminals or groups that foment conflict, and to reduce human suffering around the world. Oversight is essential, but it must be balanced and practical. While Bill C-233 means well, its overly broad scope would create obstacles for Canadian businesses, slow trade and limit Canada's ability to respond effectively to global challenges.

When we debated Bill C-47, we discussed many of the measures in the bill before us today that concern exemptions. What was true then remains true today in terms of the need to include these measures in our system. In short, the proposals in Bill C-233 would disrupt a balance that we are able to achieve through existing legislation, regulations and policies.

• (1820)

[English]

Let me explain further. The world is changing. Conflicts are evolving and new threats are emerging. Canada must stay agile and ready to respond.

Canada's export control regime was built to keep pace with this changing world. Our risk-managed framework provides the tools needed to act swiftly, doing so, for example, by adding items to the export control list to prevent sensitive technologies from being misused.

Decisions on export permits are taken carefully after a rigorous process that involves a range of experts from across government. This includes evaluating permit applications against the criteria

drawn from the Arms Trade Treaty and embedded in Canadian law through the Export and Import Permits Act.

[Translation]

Our system is flexible, but that flexibility does not mean that we are cutting corners. We have a carefully designed risk management framework that balances our national security, international obligations and defence partnerships with the commercial ties that support economic growth in Canada. Our process is designed to take into account intelligence, diplomatic information and human rights considerations. We work closely with Canada's missions abroad, our allies and partners, to make informed decisions that reflect the realities on the ground.

[English]

As parliamentarians and Canadians are aware, Canada has suspended or revoked permits when credible evidence of misuse has emerged. Any violations of the Export and Import Permits Act are taken extremely seriously. Those who are found to have breached the law face consequences, including fines, seizures and criminal prosecutions. That is how we help to protect lives and uphold our values. We will always work to do so.

Bill C-233 would hinder our ability to continue with this risk-based approach in three significant ways.

First, Bill C-233 seeks to create a statutory definition of arms that could potentially include items that are not weapons at all, such as navigation systems, software and even basic mechanical parts. The bill's proposed definition could have Canada needlessly regulating thousands of products, from nuts and bolts to steel and aluminum. This would put Canada out of step with allies, whose focus is rightly on high-risk technologies and high-risk destinations. Further, this would overwhelm our export control system, require staggering increases in government resources, slow legitimate trade and hurt Canada's reputation and Canadian businesses, especially small and medium-sized manufacturers, which rely on predictable rules.

*Adjournment Proceedings**[Translation]*

Second, this bill seeks to prescribe how export applications are assessed by adding new mandatory requirements for governments to certify the end use of items purchased by private companies in their countries. Not only does this go well beyond what is required by the Arms Trade Treaty, but it would be virtually impossible to implement. Most countries simply do not issue official end-use certificates to private entities. Canada would have neither the authority nor the influence to enforce this provision, and imposing it would only block legitimate exports, including potentially those destined for our allies in Ukraine.

What is more, Canada already conducts thorough end-use and destination risk assessments. End use is verified using a variety of reliable methods. These may include end-use certificates issued by a government when it imports items itself, or other assurances provided by reputable private parties for private exports.

Canada assesses destination countries based on factors such as the strength of their export control systems and the risk of diversion, consistent with how our allies operate. The proposed addition to our assessment criteria would not make the world a safer place. Rather, it would hurt Canadian businesses and their customers, including the Canadian Armed Forces and our NATO allies at a time when we need them most, and undermine Canada's role as a trusted partner.

- (1825)

[English]

Third, Bill C-233 would impose costs and burdens on ordinary Canadians. Like many of our allies, Canada uses expedited licensing in specific circumstances for lower-risk military and dual-use items to countries with similarly robust approaches to export controls. This is a standard international practice that enables defence trade to move quickly and securely without compromising oversight and the agility it requires in a rapidly divided world, at a time when we are trying to increase our defence capacity, not decrease it.

[Translation]

This bill would disrupt the balance we have worked so hard to achieve. It proposes restrictions that would increase costs for both the government and Canadian businesses, without improving the quality of decisions. This bill would end the current system that allows most military goods and technology to be exported to the United States without the need for individual permits, which would harm an important trade and defence relationship.

In fact, this bill goes beyond what it claims to do in this area. It would cancel all existing export permits, including long-standing general export and brokering permits. This means that Canadian companies, many of which have already undergone rigorous review, would be forced to start from scratch and re-apply for permits, affecting hard-working Canadian companies that already have very limited resources.

As a result, I wish to inform the House that we are unable to support this bill as it stands, but I think it is important to thank the member for Vancouver East for bringing it before the House.

[English]

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I will not have more time to discuss Bill C-233, the amendments being proposed by the NDP to the Export and Import Permits Act.

The intent is laudable in wanting to make sure that Canadian-made weapons and components are not being used in weapons by our adversaries, like terrorist organizations. Iran was using components in the Shahed drones that were bombing Israel, and they have been sold to Russia and are being used against the great people of Ukraine. We want to make sure that that does not happen and that we hold companies to account when they have sold components and weapons to other suppliers and they have ended up in the hands of our adversaries.

However, we know by what is being proposed in Bill C-233 that we would have an added layer of bureaucracy that would slow down the sale of parts, weapons, platforms and technology to our allies and partners. One thing that is going to happen with this bill is it would require that no country gets an exemption. Therefore, none of our NATO allies, none of our Five Eyes partners and none of our friends in the Middle East or Ukraine would be able to go to our suppliers and Canadian businesses to buy the parts and weapons systems they need to defend their sovereign territory. We want to make sure that does not interfere with the overall operations of our defence industry and our relationships with our allies.

I have to stress that, when we look at this, we have to remember, as Canadians, that our sovereignty is also threatened by this. Part of our sovereign capacity and capability is having a strong defence industry. When we have a defence industry that exports over \$7 billion of the \$9.6 billion it produces on an annual basis, and 63% of that goes to the United States, we have to protect that to ensure that those industries survive.

I will carry on this conversation the next time we rise on Bill C-233.

- (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I thank the hon. member. He will have about seven and a half minutes coming back to him the next time the House considers this matter.

[Translation]

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Adjournment Proceedings

[English]

HOUSING

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise and again speak on an issue close to my heart and to the next generation of young Canadians, which of course is the issue of housing and the lack of housing in Canada.

Build Canada Homes, this new bureaucracy, is emblematic of what is wrong with government thinking these days. It is what is wrong with Liberal plans these days. For every problem, there is a new government-driven response. For childhood nutrition problems, we have a government-run lunch program. For bad actors on the Internet, we have a government-run censorship program. For a lack of housing supply, we have not one, not two, not even three, but four government-run bureaucracies. If any of these Liberal solutions worked, after 10 years, we would have seen things improve. However, in fact, in housing, the opposite has taken place. It is now more difficult than it has ever been in Canadian history for the next generation to own a home anywhere in Canada.

Even if we thought another government bureaucracy was the solution, Build Canada Homes will not fix our housing woes. That is because this bureaucracy's stated objective is only with respect to non-market housing, which means affordable housing and at non-market rates. This means that most Canadians, those of middle income or higher, will see zero benefit from this new bureaucracy.

Estimates suggest that this new bureaucracy will deliver only between 1% and 2% of the needed new home supply. Even at full capacity, the non-market focus would therefore only address a tiny fraction of the overall supply gap in Canada. A report from the Canadian Home Builders Association agrees, saying, "With the non-market housing focus of BCH, it will only impact a small fragment of what will be required to achieve the government's 500,000 homes per year target."

How about unimaginable speeds? The only thing that this budget could point to with respect to housing was the selection of certain sites for construction, maybe sometime in the future; a few hundred homes in the north, maybe in the future; and a few hundred in Toronto, maybe in the future. That is a far cry from the 500,000 new homes that the Liberals' own housing agency says need to be built in Canada, and that is just to get us back to 2019 affordability levels. In fact, the government's own housing bureaucracy said just this week that housing starts are actually down again year over year. CMHC reported this week that housing starts are down 3% year over year.

My question for the parliamentary secretary is this: Can she please try to explain how a new government bureaucracy that builds only non-market homes at unimaginably slow speeds will allow the next generation to afford a home in Canada?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is taking action to build the infrastructure communities need and to make housing more affordable for Canadians. Budget 2025, "Canada Strong", delivers generational investments to meet these goals. It includes \$51 billion for a new infrastructure program, with \$17 billion dedicated to housing enabling infrastruc-

ture. This will allow cuts to development charges that will significantly bring down the cost of housing for Canadians.

We are also addressing the housing crisis head-on with the recent launch of Build Canada Homes. This new federal agency will finance and build affordable housing at scale. It will leverage public lands, offer flexible financial incentives, attract private capital, facilitate large portfolio projects and support manufacturers to build the homes Canadians need.

Build Canada Homes will prioritize large-scale, long-term solutions to build on the successes of existing housing initiatives with a team Canada approach. These programs include the affordable housing fund and the apartment construction loan program, which have built hundreds of thousands of new homes and repaired hundreds of thousands more.

We have also seen how the \$4.4-billion housing accelerator fund is eliminating barriers to development. So far, we have signed agreements with more than 240 communities across the country that have committed to cutting red tape and streamlining the development process.

The Government of Canada is dedicated to making Canada's housing market work better for everyone. We are focused on affordability, and we are building a stronger Canada.

We are not stopping there. The federal government is also reducing barriers to home ownership so that young people are not priced out of the housing market. Measures like the tax-free first home savings account and the homebuyers' plan help Canadians save for their first home. We have also made changes to mortgage financing rules to help more buyers qualify. Importantly, we are eliminating the goods and services tax, the GST, for the first time on homebuyers of new homes at or under \$1 million and reducing GST on new homes up to \$1.5 million.

Young Canadians deserve the same opportunities that previous generations enjoyed, and we are making that happen. The Government of Canada will continue to work closely with home builders, indigenous partners and all levels of government to deliver results. We are putting affordability front and centre, and we will innovate, invest and remove barriers so that every Canadian can find a place to call home.

• (1835)

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, if saying “generational” again and again built homes, we would not be here tonight having this discussion, but we know it does not build homes. In fact, we know the next generation is having the most difficult time in history owning a home.

The parliamentary secretary said she did not want the next generation priced out of the market. Well, here is a news flash: They are priced out of the market. The average salary in Canada no longer buys the average home in Canada. Young Canadians just want the same opportunity their parents and their grandparents had: to work hard and have the opportunity to buy a home.

Does the parliamentary secretary agree with me that the average salary in Canada should buy the average home in Canada? Will she admit that 10 years of Liberal proposals have done nothing to make that better?

Jennifer McKelvie: Mr. Speaker, this government is focused on restoring affordability and lowering housing costs. Build Canada Homes will build and finance affordable housing by partnering with builders and housing providers focused on long-term affordability. It will prioritize Canadian-made materials and modern methods of construction, such as factory-built housing, to catalyze a new Canadian housing industry, one that builds faster and more sustainably.

We are working closely with provinces, territories, municipalities and indigenous communities to improve affordability and build the supply Canada needs. The government is committed to making housing more affordable and more attainable, while growing the strength and resilience of Canada's economy at the same time, because every Canadian deserves a place to call home so they can focus on building a successful future for themselves and for their families.

FINANCE

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, most Canadians do not spend their evenings reading budget tables or credit reports, and frankly they should not have to. In a well-run country, those numbers are supposed to be boring. However, nothing about Canada's finances is boring right now, because the government has pushed us into territory where ordinary families are paying the price for extraordinary mismanagement.

Let us start with the simplest truth, one that is understood by any family, business or responsible adult: One cannot spend more than one earns forever. When a government does it, the consequences do not hit the politician who overspent; they hit Canadians. They show up in higher taxes, prices and interest rates, and they show up when one's grocery bill climbs but one's paycheque does not. Overspending may happen in Ottawa, but the fallout lands on Canadians' dinner tables, in their gas tanks and in their monthly budgets.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed, to the Liberals' great irritation, the very thing they hoped no one would say out loud: The deficit is not shrinking like they said it would. It is doubling, not because of a recession or an emergency but because the government has chosen to grow spending by tens of billions of dollars. When government expands operating spending faster than the

Adjournment Proceedings

economy grows, deficits explode. This is not a conspiracy theory; it is arithmetic.

The government insists that all this spending is investment. That would be convenient if it were true, but a label does not change reality. An investment is something that pays back, and a cost is something paid for. Confusing the two does not make someone sophisticated; it makes them irresponsible. A family understands this intuitively. Buying a new tool for work is an investment, while buying a new flat-screen TV for a man cave is a cost. Both may be great, but only one produces a return.

The government has been calling almost everything it does an investment, even things that are clearly not. Museums and cultural centres may sound great, but they do not generate revenue for the country, pay down the debt or expand Canada's productivity. They are costs. There is nothing wrong with costs when we can afford them, but it is dangerous to pretend that costs will magically behave like investments.

The PBO found that the government inflated its so-called capital investments by \$94 billion simply by renaming ordinary spending as assets. Other countries do not do that, and nor do accountants and economists. It is the kind of creative bookkeeping that hides problems rather than solving them.

Now we see the consequence. Fitch Ratings, the agency responsible for evaluating our financial health, has warned of a downgrade of Canada's credit rating. That is not a symbolic gesture; it is the financial world's saying out loud what many Canadians have already begun to feel, which is that we do not trust the government to manage debt. A downgrade will mean we pay more to borrow. When we owe as much as Canada does, that is not a small problem. It means that the interest on the debt grows faster and that more tax dollars go toward servicing yesterday's overspending instead of building tomorrow's opportunities.

Canadians deserve honesty. They deserve a government that understands the difference between spending and investing. They deserve policies rooted in reality, not wishful thinking. Above all, they deserve leadership that protects the next generation instead of sending them the bill for this one.

How do we quit maxing out the national credit card and pull Canada back from the edge before the next generation pays the price?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1840)

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the international orders and trading systems that powered Canada's prosperity for decades are quickly being changed and drastically reshaped, threatening our sovereignty, our prosperity and our values. Faced with these realities, where others would simply endeavour to weather the storm, our government is rising up to meet the moment with humility, vigour and confidence.

Budget 2025 is the generational plan Canada needs to build our economy, protect our way of life and empower Canadians like never seen before. We will build here at home, including supports for industries impacted by tariffs, nation-building infrastructure through the new Major Projects Office, and millions more homes for Canadians, including through a new agency, Build Canada Homes. We will protect what matters most, which are our people, our community and our sovereignty, by investing in our Armed Forces and border security and by rolling out bail reforms to ensure safer streets for all.

We will empower Canadians with better careers, strong public services and a more affordable life with measures to drive down competition in key sectors, automatic federal benefits that will reach up to 5.5 million low-income Canadians and a permanent national food program. With budget 2025's new trade diversification strategy, supported by a trade diversification corridors fund, we will explore new markets and sell more of the best that Canada has to offer.

We know that to make these generational investments, our government must make certain adjustments. This includes a new framework for budgeting, the cornerstone of which is a new capital budgeting framework that prioritizes spending that stimulates public and private sector capital investment while reining in day-to-day operational spending, which rose significantly during COVID and the post-COVID era. In doing so, we are creating a more efficient and productive government for the future.

The government will balance day-to-day operating spending with revenues by 2028 to 2029, while maintaining a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. We will do this while enabling \$1 trillion in total investment over the next five years through smarter public spending and stronger capital investment. A key part of this process is the comprehensive expenditure review, which will reduce inefficiencies and refocus government spending on core priorities. It will rein in government spending, saving Canada \$13 billion annually by 2028 to 2029, for a total with other savings and revenues of \$60 billion over five years. Savings will be achieved by restructuring operations and consolidating internal services and rightsizing programs to realize efficiency. This will allow the government to invest more in the workers, businesses and nation-building infrastructure that will build Canada strong. By making these adjustments now, we are making it possible to build the strongest economy in the G7.

• (1845)

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, this budget is all about the magical \$1 trillion investment boom, as if private investors are lining up to pour hundreds of billions of dollars into Canada, but so far, the Prime Minister has circled the globe four times, literally, with basi-

cally almost nothing to show for it because businesses do not invest where the numbers do not add up and, right now, the numbers do not add up.

Fitch Ratings, one of the world's major financial watchdogs, just warned that in this budget, Canada's finances are heading in the wrong direction. It stated straight up in its report that the government has a pattern of promising one number and then spending way more every time. Even more shocking is that the report says that, when it comes to the rules, they mean absolutely nothing because the Liberals do not follow them anyway. Just last year, they broke all three targets they set for budget 2024. An investor has the entire globe to choose from. They are not going to choose the one country that spins a great story but never keeps its promises.

Maggie Chi: Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 meets the moment Canada finds itself in with a responsible fiscal plan that would build Canada as an economic force for decades to come. The world is changing, and we must meet the moment by building on the solid foundation of strong Canadian industries bolstered by diverse international trade partners and the undeniable fact that we have exactly what the world needs.

By becoming our own best customers, we will transform our economy from one of reliance on specific trade partners to the one that is more resilient to global shocks. With budget 2025, we will spend less, invest more and build Canada as an economic force for decades to come. We will make life more affordable for Canadians from coast to coast to coast, and we will build Canada strong.

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as members are well aware, I am rising again, as I have on many occasions in the past, to raise the issue of mental health for Canadians and the government's failure to follow through on its commitments. I am flagging that again because mental health is health.

Back on October 7, I asked the minister why the Liberals were abandoning their promise to make mental health a full and equal part of Canada's universal public health care system. At the time, I indicated this: "It is estimated [that] every dollar invested in mental health generates two dollars of long-term savings, while untreated mental health issues cost our economy more than \$50 billion every year."

Adjournment Proceedings

First of all, I need to correct the record right now. That figure of \$50 billion was from 2012. A new report released earlier this year by the Mental Health Commission of Canada estimates that the monetary cost associated with untreated mental health issues is actually more like \$200 billion. That is an increase of \$150 billion over 13 years.

I asked the Minister of Health to acknowledge that it is time to invest in the mental health of Canadians as a nation-building project. The response I received during question period, and I am being quite generous here, was woefully disappointing. She said, "Mental health is top of mind for this new government".

We do not see that reality reflected in actual investment dollars in the past budget, apart from some funding for youth mental health that the NDP helped advocate for. Again, the Liberals made commitments in their 2025 election campaign that they would make the youth mental health fund permanent and earmark \$150 million per year toward it, beginning this year and continuing through fiscal year 2028-29. They failed to do that.

What happened to these great ideas between the recent federal election and the budget? Even if the government followed through on its campaign promises, these figures are woefully inadequate, and they fall far short of meeting the \$200 billion in annual costs to the Canadian economy resulting from untreated mental health issues, as I stated earlier. If the government is actually serious about improving productivity in this country, we need to double investments in mental health and we need to support workers, especially when we look at nation building. Investing in mental health is nation building. It does help support the GDP.

We are only spending about half what our peer countries do on mental health, when we look at the OECD average, and we are seeing the results of that underfunding. I go outside, and I can see the impact. Every family in this country is touched by someone struggling with mental health issues. Mental health funding is an investment in Canada's workforce, and while the youth mental health fund is an important investment, we need to ensure that all Canadians can access appropriate supports.

The Canadian Institute for Health Information found in data published just last month that in 2024, 41% of Canadian adults and 36% of children who needed mental health care had needs that were only partially met or were completely unmet. That shows we have a long way to go. As Canadians, we pride ourselves on taking care of each other, but right now too many people are being left to struggle on their own.

It is time to change that. It is time to finally bring mental health into our universal public health care system. That is why I tabled the first private member's bill in the 45th Parliament, Bill C-201. If that bill was passed, it would bring community-based mental health services into the Canada Health Act so that we would have parity, and all Canadians would access supports with a health card, not a credit card.

My question for the minister and the parliamentary secretary is whether they will commit here and now to fixing the Canada Health Act to ensure that we have parity with mental and physical

health and make sure that it is implemented in our universal public health care system.

• (1850)

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by sincerely thanking my hon. colleague for the very important question. I have tremendous respect for his work on mental health and for the work he does on behalf of his constituents. His commitment to the issue elevates our conversation in the House, and I am grateful for his leadership.

I rise today to reaffirm our government's commitment to supporting the mental health and well-being of Canadians. Mental health is health, as my hon. colleague mentioned, and we know that too many people still face barriers to accessing the care they need. This is why our approach is rooted in collaboration. We are working closely with provinces and territories, those who deliver care on the front lines, because meaningful, lasting change requires coordinated partnerships across all orders of government.

Our work is guided by three priorities: expanding access, improving quality and advancing equity.

We know that youth are facing disproportionate challenges, especially indigenous and Black youth, youth in rural and remote communities, and young men and boys. That is why we are delivering the youth mental health fund, a \$500-million investment over five years to enhance and expand mental health supports across the country. A core component of that work is strengthening integrated youth services. These hubs provide a one-stop shop where young people can access mental health care, primary care, substance use support, and help with education and employment. Today there are more than 110 hubs operating in nine provinces, with 50 more in development.

Since 2022, over \$118 million has been invested to strengthen this network and support national collaboration, and the work continues. Just last month, the Minister of Health announced \$10 million in Health Canada funding for Kickstand, to expand integrated youth services in Alberta.

We are also ensuring that practitioners and families have the tools they need. Earlier this year, we released new clinical practice guidelines for managing mood and anxiety disorders in the perinatal period, along with a patient and family guide. These resources support consistent evidence-based care that Canadians can trust.

Adjournment Proceedings

Suicide prevention remains a top priority. Through Canada's first national suicide prevention action plan, we are coordinating efforts with provinces, territories, indigenous partners and experts to reduce risk and save lives. A cornerstone of this work is 988, Canada's suicide crisis helpline. It is free, confidential and available 24-7 in English and French, by voice and text. Between November 2023 and July 2025, 988 answered over 600,000 calls and texts. It is a lifeline for people in crisis, and we are committed to strengthening it.

Mental health care must be safe, accessible and inclusive. Our government is investing in the future, not only through funding but also through partnerships, innovation and a shared vision with provinces and territories. Together we are building a mental health system that meets people where they are, supports them throughout their lives and reflects the compassion and care Canadians deserve. Mental health is health, and we will continue to make it a priority for all Canadians.

Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, this month being Movember, I attended an event last evening on the topic of men's mental health, which included having the opportunity to chat with Michelle Terry, Movember's global CEO, about the importance of investing in the unique health challenges facing men and boys. This is something the health minister specifically referenced in her own remarks at the event last night.

Two in five Canadian men will die prematurely, before the age of 75. Death by suicide is the second-leading cause of death for men aged 15 to 44 in this country. Seventy-two per cent of Canadians can think of a man or boy who has been impacted by stigma, health care delays and mental health struggles. Two in five men, like I

said, will die prematurely, but 95% of Canadians agree that improving men's mental health will benefit everyone, not just men.

Will the government turn its words into action and support a properly funded, nation-wide mental health strategy for men and boys? I am hoping ministers will be able to answer that question today. It is something that is absolutely needed. There is a crisis.

● (1855)

Maggie Chi: Mr. Speaker, mental health matters deeply to Canadians and to Parliament. I want to again thank my hon. colleague for raising the issue and for his important work on it. Our government shares these concerns and remains firmly committed to advancing safe, effective and innovative mental health care across the country.

We continue to engage with leading experts from movements like Movember, invest in evidence-based approaches, and work closely with provinces and territories, so that federal support is aligned with the realities on the ground. Together we are building a more responsive and inclusive mental health system, one that meets Canadians where they are and supports them throughout their lives.

Again, I look forward to continuing this work with my hon. colleague in order to advance it.

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

(The House adjourned at 6:56 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 19, 2025

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Immigration Pilot Program	
Kwan	3803
A novel by Kamal Benkirane	
Sari	3803
Canadian Western Agribition	
Steinley	3803
Diabetes Awareness Month	
Sidhu (Brampton South)	3804
Ron Bradley	
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	3804
World War I	
Lavoie	3804
Anniversary Wishes	
Berthold	3804
Remembrance Day Leaders	
Hepfner	3804
Affordability	
Kramp-Neuman	3805
Rémi Quirion	
Blanchette-Joncas	3805
Craque-Bitume	
Duclos	3805
The Budget	
Bailey	3805
Peter Perry Award Winner	
Turnbull	3805
Powell River Hydro Dams	
Gunn	3806
Uyghur Refugees	
Zuberi	3806
Prime Minister of Canada	
Albas	3806
Holodomor	
Baker	3806

ORAL QUESTIONS

Finance	
Poilievre	3807
Joly	3807
International Trade	
Poilievre	3807
Joly	3807

Finance	
Poilievre	3807
Hajdu	3807
International Trade	
Poilievre	3808
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3808
Natural Resources	
Poilievre	3808
Hodgson	3808
Poilievre	3808
MacKinnon	3808
Canadian Identity and Culture	
Blanchet	3808
Guilbeault	3809
Blanchet	3809
Guilbeault	3809
Blanchet	3809
Guilbeault	3809
Finance	
Deltell	3809
Provost	3809
Deltell	3809
Gainey	3809
Uppal	3810
Long	3810
Uppal	3810
Long	3810
Menegakis	3810
Church	3810
Menegakis	3810
Church	3810
Martel	3811
Gull-Masty	3811
The Economy	
Blanchet	3811
Joly	3811
Blanchet	3811
Joly	3811
International Trade	
Lantsman	3811
MacKinnon	3811
Lantsman	3811
Turnbull	3812
The Economy	
Strahl	3812
Solomon	3812
Strahl	3812
Hajdu	3812

Deschênes-Thériault	3822
Steinley	3823
Chagger	3823
Lantsman	3823
Lantsman	3824
Duclos	3825
Bonin	3825
Steinley	3826
Anderson	3826
Lamoureux	3827
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	3827
Eyolfson	3827
Bonin	3828
Garon	3828
Duclos	3831
Bailey	3831
Savard-Tremblay	3831
Deschênes-Thériault	3832
Aboultaif	3832
Lamoureux	3832
Deschênes-Thériault	3832
Anstey	3834
Bonin	3834
Duclos	3835
Boulerice	3835
Duclos	3835
Rowe	3836
Bonin	3836
Lavoie	3836

Anstey	3837
--------------	------

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Export and Import Permits Act

Kwan	3837
Bill C-233. Second reading	3837
Savard-Tremblay	3839
Bezan	3839
Boulerice	3840
Oliphant	3840
Chong	3841
Savard-Tremblay	3842
Fortier	3844
Bezan	3845

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Housing

Mantle	3846
McKelvie	3846

Finance

Jansen	3847
Chi	3848

Mental Health and Addictions

Johns	3848
Chi	3849

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>