



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 057
Thursday, November 20, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 20, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1000)
[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 12 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business met to consider the orders for the second reading of private members' bills originating in the Senate and recommended that the items listed herein, which have been determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

* * *

PETITIONS

SAFE CONSUMPTION SITE

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise for I believe the fourth or fifth time on behalf of angered parents at Abbotsford Traditional School who are opposed to the safe consumption site proposed by BC Housing across the street from the school track.

Parents are calling upon the Government of Canada to enforce its special arrangement with British Columbia, to respect the innocence of children and to cease all funding to BC Housing until it

respects federal rules and jurisdictions in the application of the unfortunate decriminalization policy between the federal government and the Province of B.C.

OJIBWAY NATIONAL URBAN PARK

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a certified petition on behalf of the great residents of Windsor West and the surrounding region.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the ecological, cultural and community significance of the Ojibway Prairie Complex and the adjacent natural areas, which are home to rare and endangered species and lands of great importance to indigenous people. They note that the proposal to establish an Ojibway national urban park has been advanced in Parliament, most recently by a private member's bill, Bill C-248, in the last Parliament.

This has already been considered by all the appropriate committees. The petitioners therefore respectfully request that the Government of Canada, in collaboration with Parks Canada, the City of Windsor and the relevant first nations and provincial partners, take the necessary steps to finalize and enact the designation of an Ojibway national urban park to ensure long-term protection, ecological restoration and public access for current and future generations.

I am tabling this petition on their behalf with great pride and honour.

* * *

● (1005)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

*Speaker's Ruling***REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE**

COWICHAN TRIBES LAND RULING

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that I have received notice of a request for an emergency debate. I invite the hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes to rise and make a brief intervention.

Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to formally request, following adjournment of the House, a debate on an important matter requiring urgent consideration, pursuant to Standing Order 52, regarding the national implications of the recent Cowichan Tribes v. Canada court decision, the subsequent notices issued to homeowners in British Columbia and the profound uncertainty now surrounding Canada's land title system.

The City of Richmond has formally notified residents that the ruling may affect the status and validity of their property titles. This has caused widespread fear and confusion not only in British Columbia but right across Canada. The concerns are legitimate. The court's decision, while under appeal, raises unresolved constitutional and economic questions that extend far beyond one municipality or one region.

People deserve to know, people like Richmond farmer Gord Maichin, who said he was kept in the dark, or a business owner who learned from the news, not his government, that his industrial property might be subject to claims he had no chance to respond to. These are not speculators; these are families, employers and taxpayers who bought land in good faith and trusted their governments to act with transparency.

They were never informed. They feel blindsided because federal and provincial governments held discussions behind closed doors, excluding the very people whose titles were at stake. Whether one agrees with the court or not, the human impact of the failure to consult is undeniable. Now ordinary Canadians fear that fee simple title, something relied on for generations, may no longer be secure.

True reconciliation cannot be achieved by undermining private property rights. Aboriginal title is unique and collective. It is not simply another interest in the land. By declaring it senior to fee simple, the ruling casts doubt on the indefeasibility protections that underpin our entire land title system. Without certainty, how can homeowners trust their titles? How can banks extend mortgages? How can businesses plan for the future?

This decision risks shaking the foundations of Canada's financial system, but the government chose not to notify homeowners, not to defend Crown grants and not to allow arguments that could protect fee simple holders. The ruling has created serious uncertainty about how fee simple ownership and aboriginal title legally coexist, and, in densely populated areas, whether the Land Title Act's indefeasibility protections remain stable; how mortgages, sales, insurance and municipal planning can be affected; and what compensation mechanisms exist if overlapping interests must be reconciled.

A responsible Conservative position recognizes both the need for reconciliation and the need for stability. We respect indigenous rights and the constitutional framework that protects them. At the same time, we insist on clarity, transparency and the protection of

ordinary Canadians whose life savings are tied to secure property ownership.

That is why we are calling for an emergency debate that would allow Parliament to assess the national implications of this decision and consider ways to defend fee simple property rights and protect the integrity of Canada's land title, mortgage and economic systems. This ruling does not only affect British Columbians. It affects Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Every homeowner, every farmer and every business owner deserves to know that the title they rely on is stable and not subject to retroactive reinterpretation.

This is now a national issue, not a local issue. Municipalities are uncertain about their zoning authorities. Farmers are asking whether land is still secure. Business owners are wondering if their investment can still be used for debt financing. Families want to know if the title they have held for decades still means what it was meant to mean before this ruling.

We need to follow the lead of the member for Richmond Centre—Marpole with his leadership on this file. His contributions to caucus have been outstanding. He is representing his constituents very well. He recognized this crisis immediately and is responding. This request is proposing immediate parliamentary action.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you, Mr. Speaker, approve an emergency debate at the earliest opportunity. Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes for his intervention. However, I am not satisfied that this request meets the requirements of the Standing Orders at this time.

* * *

● (1010)

[*Translation*]**PRIVILEGE**

BUDGET DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED TO MEMBERS—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on November 5 by the member for Joliette—Manawan concerning budget documents distributed to members.

In his intervention, the member alleged that due to differences between the paper version of the budget distributed to members on November 4, 2025 at both the lock-up held behind closed doors and during the sitting of the House, and the electronic PDF version available on the website of the Department of Finance, members had not had equal access to information on budgetary policy. This, he argued, undermined the ability of members—particularly opposition members—to analyze government measures, prepare for debate, and hold the government to account. The member noted that the electronic PDF version of the document contained more information than the paper version distributed to members. He further argued that members attending the budget lock-up earlier in the day were informed that the electronic version was official and complete, while others who did not attend the lock-up, only discovered this afterward. He concluded by suggesting that this resulted in members being impeded in the performance of their parliamentary duties and asked the Speaker to consider this a *prima facie* breach of privilege.

[English]

The deputy House leader of the government in the House of Commons countered that it is the budget document tabled by the minister in the House on November 4, 2025, that constitutes the official government policy and confirmed that the document was indeed complete. She commented that past Speakers' rulings clarify that budget lock-ups are not proceedings of Parliament. She concluded by affirming the government's commitment to ensuring that members receive the budget information they need, in the format of their preference, to fulfill their parliamentary functions.

What primarily concerns the Chair in this situation is therefore whether the proper tabling procedures were followed and if information was intentionally withheld from members.

In a ruling on alleged misleading budget documents, Speaker Sauvé stated clearly on April 26, 1983, at page 24867 of the Debates:

Ministers, and not the Chair, are responsible for anything they might table concerning the administrative responsibilities of the Government. The Chair is competent to determine whether or not the tabling procedure observed is correct. It is not responsible for the content of the documents themselves.

[Translation]

At the time designated for the budget presentation, the minister moved the usual motion, tabled a series of ways and means motions, and tabled a paper copy of what constitutes the official version of the budget document. To this end, the Chair is satisfied that the proper procedures were followed.

The member noted that the hard copy he received does not contain all the information found in the electronic version. The Chair agrees that fulsome budgetary information should be available to members, so that they can more easily conduct their analysis of the government's policy. That said, it is always possible that more extensive information can be found in other sources, even if these are not tabled in the House.

The Chair must examine this matter through the lens of the high threshold for adjudicating questions of privilege, and, in the present case, no contradictory information seems to have been deliberately

Privilege

provided, and no information seems to have been intentionally withheld.

[English]

Accordingly, the Chair concludes that the member has not been impeded in the discharge of his duties and, therefore, does not find this matter constitutes a *prima facie* question of privilege.

The Chair welcomes the interpretation provided by the deputy government House leader that the official and complete budgetary document was the one tabled by the minister. That being said, the Chair wishes to express concern with the idea that the electronic PDF version of the document might be seen by others as the official and complete version of the budget or, as is indicated in the version available online, that, "In case of discrepancy between the printed version and the electronic version, the electronic version will prevail." From the Chair's point of view, the authoritative version of the budget remains the one tabled in the House, not the one published on the department's website.

I thank all members for their attention.

* * *

● (1015)

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege raised by the member for Edmonton West on November 17 brings up what we believe is an important issue. The Parliamentary Budget Officer's assertion that the government has unjustifiably delayed or refused to provide essential information is very troubling and shows that his ability to fully exercise his mandate under the Parliament of Canada Act has been impeded. According to section 79.01, the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall "support Parliament by providing analysis, including analysis of macro-economic and fiscal policy, for the purposes of raising the quality of parliamentary debate and promoting greater budget transparency and accountability".

The act is clear and unequivocal. Parliament itself enacted specific legislation to guarantee that the Parliamentary Budget Officer remains independent while performing his duties. These measures were specifically designed to elevate the quality of parliamentary debates and ensure that there is greater transparency and accountability in budgetary matters. The Parliamentary Budget Officer requested that the government provide him with additional information regarding the budget that he deemed necessary to fulfill his mandate, as provided for in subsection 79.4(1) of the Act.

Government Orders

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the House that the government has a legal obligation to co-operate with the Parliamentary Budget Officer's requests as an officer of Parliament. It is incumbent upon the House itself to assert its powers and protect the Parliamentary Budget Officer's mandate under the Parliament of Canada Act. The ultimate goal of those provisions is to assist members in their work as parliamentarians. The offices of the Parliamentary Budget Officer and the Auditor General of Canada were created precisely to allow all elected members of the House of Commons to fully carry out their role and hold the government to account.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer provides independent economic and financial analysis to the Parliament of Canada. This allows for better fiscal transparency, which ensures a better understanding of economic and fiscal policies and greater accountability. Officers of Parliament are and must remain independent of the government. That is why they are governed by the Parliament of Canada Act.

Since members of Parliament were denied an analysis based on all the information deemed necessary by the Parliamentary Budget Officer himself as an officer of Parliament, it seems logical to raise the issue of a potential breach of parliamentary privilege. I therefore agree with the member who raised this issue. It is up to Parliament itself to intervene to defend its powers and those of its officers. The violation of a legal obligation to provide a document constitutes a serious breach of privilege, since it undermines the authority and dignity of the House.

In closing, this is not the first time this has happened. It is a recurring and systemic problem within Parliament that exists regardless of the political party in power. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has explicitly requested Parliament's support in obtaining the data necessary for his budget analysis, and his inability to obtain that data prevents members from debating important elements of the budget in an informed manner. I would therefore ask the Chair to rule that there is a *prima facie* question of privilege so that the House can discuss ways to provide the Parliamentary Budget Officer with the assistance he needs to fulfill his mandate.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Saint-Jean for her intervention.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (for the Minister of Finance and National Revenue) moved that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

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.: Good morning, Mr. Speaker. It is a great day in Parliament today, and it is my pleasure to rise to introduce Bill C-15, an act that

would implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4.

A mere few weeks ago, our government tabled budget 2025, an investment budget with unprecedented measures to build big things in this country, to empower Canadians with a better life and to protect our sovereignty. This budget comes at a time when global headwinds are being felt by Canadians all across the country, in their homes, in their shops, on factory floors, in the fields, in boardrooms and truly everywhere across the nation.

From geopolitical conflicts causing uncertainty, to rising protectionism, including tariffs imposed by our closest trading partner, Canada's fundamental relationships with the world are changing. The speed, scope and scale of these changes are extraordinary and unparalleled. They are not just transformative but represent a true generational shift.

To meet this moment, our government is playing to Canada's many, many strengths to secure a better economic future for everyone, not only because we owe it to Canadians to do so but also because we know that when Canadians come together, there is nothing we cannot accomplish. No one should ever make the mistake of underestimating Canada, and on this side of the House we will never apologize for being optimistic about Canada's future, because we are here to make good things happen for Canadians. On this side of the House we believe in Canada.

This past spring, our government was elected with a clear mandate to do meaningful and significant work for this country at an important moment in our history. Budget 2025 delivers on this promise with the generational plan to build one Canadian economy instead of 13, a uniquely Canadian success story amplified by major nation-building projects that will connect our regions, diversify our markets and create hundreds of thousands of high-paying careers, from the skilled trades to advanced technologies.

Just as the railways united our country, the Trans-Canada Highway opened our frontiers and the St. Lawrence Seaway linked our economy to the world, today's major projects will be as transformative, building clean power grids for a sustainable future and expanding our ports to accelerate our trade with partners around the world.

This includes major projects like the Iqaluit hydro project, which is Inuit-owned and will be providing clean power to communities that have traditionally relied on burning 15 million litres of imported diesel fuel per year. There is also the new nuclear project at Darlington in Bowmanville, in my region of Durham, that will deploy four small modular reactors and provide clean power to 1.2 million homes while adding over 21,000 jobs and \$38.5 billion to Canada's GDP over the next 65 years.

Bill C-15 would further advance the Alto high-speed rail project, Canada's first high-speed rail, a 300-kilometre-an-hour railway from Toronto to Quebec City, whose path to construction would be accelerated, bringing us ever closer to fast travel within Canada's most populated corridor.

Bill C-15 would invest \$11.5 billion in Build Canada Homes and make \$1.5 billion available to capitalize Canada Lands Company Limited to support housing construction on properties held by the corporation. Our new trade diversification strategy will boost our global footprint, doubling overseas exports over a decade and generating \$300 billion more in trade.

All these measures and many others included in Bill C-15 speak to our clear and ambitious plan to move our economy from our traditional state of reliance on one trading partner to a state of resilience, which would help us absorb and react to any shocks our economy experiences in the future. To meet these targets, we must ensure that Canada remains an attractive place to invest and grow a business, while fostering homegrown innovation.

• (1020)

Our new productivity superdeduction will make it easier for Canadian businesses to invest in new machinery, equipment and technologies, enhancing Canada's competitive advantage over the United States and encouraging crucial business investment across the country, while boosting productivity and growth. I know that members opposite are with me on this, because they have spoken to it in the House many times. The GDP per capita and productivity must rise.

The superdeductions are exactly the type of tax measures and benefits to businesses that will cause them to invest in themselves, to bet on themselves, to increase productivity and to help increase real wages relative to the cost of living and ensure a higher standard of living for all Canadians.

Additionally, Bill C-15 would enhance Canada's scientific research and experimental development tax incentive program by increasing the enhanced credit expenditure limit to \$6 million, extending eligibility for the enhanced credit to certain Canadian public corporations and restoring capital expenditures as eligible costs.

Doing all of this plays to Canada's many strengths: a highly educated workforce, a world-class research and innovation ecosystem, stability and the rule of law, strong trading relationships with traditional and emerging markets, and sound fiscal and economic fundamentals and management.

Another one of our strengths is our strong resource and energy sector and our ongoing commitment to make Canada competitive in a decarbonizing global economy. We believe, as the vast majority of Canadians believe, that Canada must continue investing in the clean economy to drive down emissions, fight climate change and create good-paying jobs for future generations. Our government's proposed climate competitiveness strategy will drive the investments needed for Canadian businesses to compete and, most importantly, win in the net-zero future that we all know is the reality of our world.

As part of this strategy, Bill C-15 includes measures to deliver the clean electricity investment tax credit to support clean electricity technologies and a clean electricity grid, as well as to enhance the suite of existing investment tax credits to further support investments in clean technologies and clean-technology manufacturing.

Government Orders

The carbon capture, utilization and storage investment tax credit would maintain its full credit rates for an additional five years, up to 2035. The clean-technology manufacturing investment tax credit would be broadened to include more critical minerals essential for clean-technology supply chains. Similarly, the critical mineral exploration tax credit would be expanded to cover 12 more minerals, further supporting Canada's role in global clean energy supply chains.

We also are making Canada's tax system more fair. As we lay out the conditions that we believe will attract historic investments to turbocharge the Canadian economy, our new government is also focused on ensuring that Canadians can keep more of their hard-earned money in their pockets. That is why one of the first things we did after winning the spring election was reduce taxes for 22 million Canadians, which is essential tax relief at a time when Canadians really need it.

We cut taxes to lower the cost of housing for first-time homebuyers, a measure that immediately makes home ownership a reality for more Canadians, especially young families. The average rate of savings would be about \$50,000 on the purchase of a new home under \$1 million. That is significant savings for young people trying to get into the housing market.

We brought down the price of gasoline by 18¢ per litre in most provinces and territories when we cancelled the divisive consumer carbon price, while strengthening industrial carbon pricing to ensure that our industries can remain competitive for future generations.

To build upon that momentum, our government is moving forward with several important tax reforms. For starters, to help protect the financial stability of persons with disabilities, Bill C-15 would exempt the Canada disability benefit from income calculations, maximizing its benefits, and would proceed with expanding the disability supports deduction. Bill C-15 would also introduce a temporary personal support workers tax credit to provide up to \$1,100 per year to eligible PSWs, recognizing in a tangible way their vital contributions to our communities.

Government Orders

• (1025)

Additionally, the legislation would increase the lifetime capital gains exemption to apply to up to \$1.25 million of eligible capital gains, as announced in budget 2024, ensuring that Canadians with eligible capital gains will pay less tax and be better off as a result. We are also proposing to drop the underused housing tax, as well as the luxury tax on aircraft and vessels, which will respectively reduce burdensome administrative and compliance costs and support the aviation and boating industries at a time of ongoing global economic uncertainty.

We are also strengthening and protecting Canada's financial sector. We are putting more money in Canadians' pockets while also helping Canadians access their money more easily and sooner. We are making changes to Canada's financial sector, giving consumers more control of their finances. Bill C-15 would amend the Bank Act to raise the first amount of immediately available deposited cheque funds from \$100 to \$150 and remove the timing distinction between funds deposited in person and those done via other means. This will give more Canadians easier access to their own money and reduce reliance on short-term credit, such as payday loans or overdraft protection, especially for low-income Canadians and seniors.

Bill C-15 would also amend the Bank Act, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act and the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act to make it easier for credit unions to enter the federal framework and expand so that they can continue to serve more Canadians. Notably, the legislation will also advance the government's commitment to open banking by completing the consumer-driven banking legislative framework. This will enable secure financial data sharing in Canada and facilitate access to lower-cost products, clearer choices and better tools to manage debt and reduce financial stress for Canadians.

Additionally, Bill C-15 would create a regulated space for stablecoins, a type of cryptocurrency whose value is usually tied to a government-issued currency, further supporting innovation in the financial sector and helping build trust in digital payments. We are also cracking down on sophisticated financial crimes, from ghost texts and mysterious links to masked voice-over calls and phony bank emails, all of which threaten the financial well-being of Canadians everywhere. These are becoming increasingly sophisticated and harder to detect, but Bill C-15 will amend the Bank Act to require banks to have policies and procedures to detect and prevent consumer-targeted fraud and, to mitigate its impacts, collect and report data on fraud to the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada and allow consumers to disable certain account features and adjust maximum transaction amounts.

We are doing all that while also making government more efficient. To deliver on this investment budget, Canada's new government is spending less on government operations to invest more in the workers, businesses and nation-building infrastructure that will surely grow our economy. Budget 2025 delivers on the government's comprehensive expenditure review so that we can right-size government and deliver \$60 billion in savings and revenues that can be deployed for other purposes over the next five years. The size of our public sector has grown significantly during the COVID and the post-COVID eras. Our public service played an invaluable

role helping Canada navigate those crises. I know Canadians are grateful and very appreciative of the role the federal government and all public servants played in that process.

We are now, however, facing a new set of challenges, and the economic headwinds we are facing mean we have to spend less on government operations so we can invest more in the growth and prosperity of our economy. To be clear, our government will continue to protect the vital programs people across the nation rely on, such as child care, dental care, prescription drug coverage, the Canada child benefit, the national school food program and so much more.

• (1030)

These are essential programs that Canadians have come to rely on. They are part of our social safety net. They benefit the most vulnerable in our society. It is imperative that we protect that social safety net. It is part of what makes the country great.

The measures I have outlined here today are ambitious and broad, but they are also integrated and interconnected into a comprehensive plan. All this, from catalyzing investment to making life more affordable for Canadians and spending less on government operations so that we can invest more in transformative projects, are part of our plan to help Canada navigate this unique moment.

These are smart, strategic investments designed to catalyze \$500 billion of new private investment into Canada over the next five years and enable \$1 trillion in total investment in Canada in five years, investments that will not only invest in people but businesses all across Canada. Canadians want to thrive. They want to see a thriving economy for generations to come.

Budget 2025 is our plan to harness Canada's many strengths and to put our country on the path to prosperity, making a strong country even stronger and more resilient. That is what budget 2025 is about. It is because we believe in Canada. It is a strategy to build at speed, at scope and at a scale not seen in generations, with Canadian workers at the core and at the centre, and with the national interest at the heart of every decision that is made.

Government Orders

I urge all hon. members to support the speedy passage of Bill C-15, so we can meet the moment we find ourselves in and, together, build a Canada that is secure, resilient and strong.

• (1035)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague spoke for, I believe, 15 minutes, talking about a generational budget. There is one thing generational about this budget, and that is the debt they are heaping on the shoulders of my grandchildren, my family, his family and the families of Canadians all across the country.

He spoke for 15 minutes, and there was not one word about mental health, not one word about the opioid crisis, to which we have lost 50,000 Canadians since 2016. Since 2016, we have lost more Canadians to overdose than we lost in World War II. There was not one mention of what the government is going to do with its generational spending in the next year.

Why?

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member opposite's work on securing a suicide prevention hotline. We worked together on that across party lines, and it was great to see. It is great that we got that done. We also moved forward, in a previous Parliament, with the youth mental health fund across Canada, which I did consultations on in my riding and was very well received. It is not to say that we are not aware of the mental health crisis in the country. In fact, I spoke about our social safety net, which does include support. When they were last renegotiated, the health transfers included a specific focus on standardizing mental health supports across the country. We have done things on this.

I want to be clear that our balance sheet in Canada is one of the strongest in the G7. We need to make these generational investments.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague often used the phrase “build a stronger Canada”.

This summer, the U.S. President posted a tweet demanding that the Prime Minister abolish the GAFAM law, which allowed us to impose a 3% tax on the web giants and would have generated a total of \$7.3 billion in public funds over five years. Those funds could then have been redistributed to the media sector without the need for any taxpayer contribution. That is pretty fantastic.

The U.S. President's tweet was obeyed. In fact, 24 hours after it was posted, the Prime Minister got rid of the infamous tax. How does obeying a tweet by the U.S. President and foregoing \$7.3 billion in public funds over five years amount to building a stronger Canada?

[*English*]

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, our Prime Minister and ministers on the front bench have said time and time again that Canada cannot control the temperament of leaders around the world. We also cannot control their trade policies. What we get to control is our response. Our Prime Minister and members of cabinet are working diligently to diversify trade so that we are less reliant on one trad-

ing partner, as well as working to smooth out the relationship with the United States, which is obviously complex and challenging right now.

We have introduced many tax measures that members opposite can be very positive about in this piece of legislation. This includes the capital gains rollover on small business investments, the lifetime capital gains exemption, exempting the Canada disability benefit from income and the home accessibility tax credit. There are so many more measures in the BIA that I am quite proud of and a whole suite of investment tax credits to support a clean economy.

These are really positive tax measures, and I hope the members opposite will support them.

• (1040)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member spent some time talking about trade. It is absolutely critical that we do spend time talking about trade.

In terms of the United States being our number one trading partner, we made a commitment to diversify our trade and to look at doubling exports in the next 10 years beyond the United States. This is one reason that, virtually for the first time in history, we have a Prime Minister who has committed to doing just that. That is why he is in the U.A.E. That is why he is going to South Africa. Participating in and encouraging additional trade will benefit all Canadians.

Can the member provide his thoughts on whether economic sovereignty is best achieved by expanding our trading opportunities?

Ryan Turnbull: As usual, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with my colleague. It is clear that with the economic headwinds we are experiencing and with the uncertainty that remains fairly prevalent in our economy, our government needs to step up and do what is necessary to diversify trade, to replace the demand that is not there right now from U.S. trade partners and to ensure that our industries can grow and thrive so that we can counteract the economic headwinds, the drag on the economy, that the trade friction with the United States has created.

This means that we have to invest in infrastructure to get more of our goods and products to foreign markets. It means that we need to have an industrial policy that encourages investment and remains attractive to global capital. It means that we have to buy Canadian and have a strong policy to ensure that Canadian workers can build using Canadian materials to build a stronger Canada.

Government Orders

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that the rhetoric from the government is not meeting the economic reality Canada is facing right now.

I served with the member on the industry committee. In 2023, he spoke extensively about the critical minerals strategy tied to battery electrification projects in Canada. Those have all fallen apart in recent months. In fact, right now, the Government of Canada is still subsidizing Stellantis as it moves its operations to the United States. That was in the contract the government signed.

The member outlined that the Liberals want to double overseas exports, yet the budget does not outline a strategy to meet that very ambitious goal. How are the Liberals going to do that when they allocated only \$5 billion for trade and export-related infrastructure over five years? That is a drop in the bucket.

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, Canada is blessed with natural resources. It is one of our strategic advantages around the world, especially with the world wanting more of what Canada has to offer. Critical minerals are essential. We have a strategy that is embedded in the budget. There are significant investments with the sovereign fund. There are significant exploration tax credits that have been enhanced and expanded to more critical minerals.

These projects are essential. We have seen many of them already referred to the Major Projects Office, with great benefit to Canada's trading relationships. We have seen our ministers sign agreements around the world with other countries to supply critical minerals at a time when they really need them.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean asked a question earlier about the digital services tax and the weakness shown by the Prime Minister, who held out for only 24 hours before obeying a tweet from the U.S. President and eliminating the digital services tax. The Bloc Québécois put forward a proposal to save the cultural industry and the media sector, especially the news media, which are currently in crisis. This tax could become a 3% levy that would generate billions of dollars and could help save culture and the media. This is an easy solution that would cost taxpayers nothing. This suggestion went nowhere, because the government refused to listen.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that. It would be an easy and accessible solution.

• (1045)

[*English*]

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that our government makes investments to preserve Canadian culture and heritage and steps up to support our media industry and journalists across the country. We have certainly heard that they are experiencing challenging times. The business model for that industry has been challenged over the last few years, mostly due to how many online outlets there are and how the information ecosystem has changed dramatically.

However, I want to focus on the many tax measures in the budget that are substantive for many Canadians across the country. I would point to the immediate expensing and accelerated depreciation for businesses across Canada, which would allow them to boost their

productivity. I ran a business for 13 years, and when someone runs a business, they put money aside to pay their taxes at the end of the year. Having these 100% writeoffs for new machinery, equipment and technology would allow businesses to make those investments immediately because they would know that they would have those tax writeoffs at the end of the year.

[*Translation*]

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to act as the spokesperson for the people of Calgary Midnapore.

[*English*]

Before I begin, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to split my time with the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, I was very proud to speak this week at the Future of Energy Global Summit. Of course, the member for Lakeland would have been a much better speaker. She has so much knowledge and experience. I want to take a moment and wish my seatmate the very best. She is a fierce advocate for her constituents and our shared Conservative values. She is in our thoughts and prayers.

The panel I was on was very relevant to today's topic. It was called "making major projects viable". Of course, this is something we as Conservatives have been advocating for for the last decade, whether it is ports, bridges, tracks, reactors or pipelines, which is of course my favourite as an Albertan. The conference was amazing and the panel was incredible, but of course I wanted to do my best to prepare for it, so I researched the bios of the panellists and the proposed major federal projects. Then I received a copy of the 2023 white paper, which included the presentations in the inaugural year of the conference. Lo and behold, the Prime Minister had presented at this conference in 2023. I thought this was interesting, so I looked to see what he had to say.

The topic of his speech was the challenges and opportunities of the energy transition. That is very interesting. I was listening. His title then was United Nations special envoy on climate action and finance.

Government Orders

One key point is that the presenter highlighted the need for approximately an additional \$3 trillion per year for a quarter of a century to meet the Paris Agreement and the net-zero targets. This is from the man who is trying to convince Canadians that he has their best interests at heart. This is from the man who wants us to believe that he is for industry, productivity and the common good of our nation. This is from the man who promised Canadians that he would increase productivity and rein in spending.

My mother taught me a very important lesson as a young woman when a close friend let me down. I think it applies here. That lesson is that, when somebody tells us who they are, we should believe them. When somebody asks for \$3 trillion, creates a deficit of \$78 billion, puts forward a budget of \$414 billion and is comfortable with a \$50-billion interest payment on debt annually, that somebody is telling us who they are, and when somebody tells us who they are, we should believe them.

In the Prime Minister's book *Values*, he spent years evangelizing carbon pricing. Carbon taxes, he insisted, should increase, yet when polling indicated that a majority of Canadians would reject carbon pricing, a position that was the cornerstone of Conservative policy under the leader of the official opposition, he announced in his 2025 platform that he had eliminated carbon pricing. This, of course, was not the case. The industrial carbon price remained. This is no surprise given his previous claim that the Canadian federal carbon pricing framework is a model for other nations. After acting for years as the global spokesperson for carbon pricing, he arrives as the Liberal candidate for Prime Minister and claims he will do away with it, yet he retained the industrial carbon tax. In his book, he goes so far as to say that global interests should take priority over national interests. We can only assume that he also, within that, includes Canada.

The Canadian energy sector has some of the strictest environmental regulations in the world, yet the Prime Minister and the government continue to impose additional barriers, citing international commitments. This approach scares away investors, delays projects and forces Canada to rely on oil from countries with no transparency or no environmental responsibility. When somebody tells us who they are, we should believe them.

Then there are the things the Prime Minister would like Canadians to believe he has achieved. He claimed, in February of 2025, at his campaign launch in Edmonton, that he had helped manage multiple crises and saved not one but two economies. The leaders who were in charge at the time have different stories to tell. Former Conservative prime minister Stephen Harper, the greatest prime minister in the history of Canada, for now, wrote that the Prime Minister's experience is not all it is cracked up to be.

• (1050)

He said his “experience is NOT the day-to-day management of Canada’s economy during the global financial crisis”. He went on to say, “I have listened, with increasing disbelief, to [the Prime Minister’s] attempts to take credit for things he had little or nothing to do with.... He has been doing this at the expense of the late Jim Flaherty, among the greatest Finance Ministers in Canada's history, who sadly is not here to defend his record.” Harper goes on, “But let me be very clear: the hard calls during the 2008-2009 global fi-

nancial crisis were made by Jim.” Former prime minister Stephen Harper went on to say that his record as an adviser to former prime minister Justin Trudeau and the Liberals was so bad.

Likewise, former prime minister of England Liz Truss said the Prime Minister “did a terrible job” as the Bank of England governor. She counts the Prime Minister as a regular among those who caused the British pound to drop to its lowest-ever rate against the U.S. dollar, citing them as those who believe in big government and high taxation. According to his record, he printed too much money, something we have seen in Canada under the Liberal government; lost control of regulation, presided over a steep decline of London and, most seriously, politicized the bank.

In the years since the Prime Minister left, it is written that his successors have been struggling to clear up the mess that the Prime Minister left. This misrepresentation even exists within his own party. He claimed in the English-language Liberal leaders' debate that it was his privilege to work with former prime minister Paul Martin when he balanced the books and kept the books balanced. The only problem is that the Prime Minister started out in finance in 2004, according to his own LinkedIn page, almost a decade after former prime minister Martin's ship-righting 1995 budget and well after Martin finished balancing the books in 1998.

Finally, we arrive at the topic of today's debate, the budget and its implementation. The Prime Minister stated, “We need discipline for our spending, it's necessary”, and that Canadians could expect a prudent budget. However, the Prime Minister's spending plans make his predecessor, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, seem like a tight-fisted miser. We have seen in his budget an increase in spending and a further \$90 billion in deficit spending over four years. Of course, that is only if the government meets its targets, which it has not done in years. It has consistently had much higher deficits than even its own projections call for.

“These are very prudent numbers”, the Prime Minister has said. The \$78 billion deficit, \$414 billion in spending this fiscal year alone and \$50 billion annually in interest on the debt is not prudence, but this is what the Prime Minister would like to have Canadians believe. The greatest predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour. The Prime Minister wants us to believe that he has put forward a budget of austerity and disciplined spending, but he also wants us to believe that he saved two economies.

Government Orders

When we look at his actions, they tell us otherwise. As poor as his actions are, his own words speak even stronger. “People will charge me with being elitist or a globalist...which...happens to be exactly what we need.” That means the Prime Minister will always put his wealthy friends first. He will always put nations before Canada. His loyalty does not lie with Canada or with Canadians. He has told us in his own words exactly who he is, and when somebody tells us who they are, we should believe them.

● (1055)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a lot to take in. It is interesting; the member said that Stephen Harper was the greatest prime minister Canada has ever had. Wow.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order, please.

The member may resume.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member made that bold statement, but I remind her that it was Stephen Harper who actually appointed the current Prime Minister to be the governor of the Bank of Canada. Having said that, I can assure the member opposite that she is in some wonderland to think that Stephen Harper would be in the top 20 of prime ministers. Let me amplify that by saying that the current Prime Minister has done more for building Canada strong in eight months than Stephen Harper did in 10 years.

Can the member give us any indication of something grand Stephen Harper actually built in 10 years?

Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, former prime minister Stephen Harper is world-renowned for having navigated Canada through the 2008 financial crisis. It is a shame that the member does not recognize this.

I would like to correct the record about what the member said. I said that former prime minister Stephen Harper was the greatest prime minister for now; that is until the member for Battle River—Crowfoot becomes our prime minister.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member a few moments ago made a comment in her speech to the effect that the Prime Minister's interests do not lie within Canada. I think it is extremely—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would like my point of order to be heard.

It is impugning motive when there are currently members asking our members to apologize because they ask a question that implies whether their interests lie in Canada or in Russia, which is currently going on. We are asked to apologize for that, yet a member of the House can suggest that another member's interests do not lie with upholding our country and the people of our country. It is extremely inappropriate and implies that their motives are not the best of intentions. All hon. members' motives must be treated as having the best of intentions.

I would encourage the Speaker to ask the member to apologize and retract the comment.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

The member is conflating two very different cases. The Chairs have ruled in the past about equating members' positions with those of violent authoritarian regimes or suggesting they are acting as agents of violent authoritarian regimes. That is clearly very different from saying that something a member does not like may suggest other things about their motivations. Those are obviously two very different things.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

● (1100)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order, please.

I am going to start by asking all hon. members to be very judicious in what they say in this place. We do not impugn motives in such a way that goes to the dignity or respect of individual members.

I am going to look back at exactly what was said, and if it is needed, we will come back to the House with a more formal ruling. At this point, we will go to questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we share the Conservative Party's views on the budget tabled by the Liberal Party, particularly the fact that there is a lot of waste, as we are now facing a generational deficit of \$78 billion.

I want to thank my colleague for her speech, and I would like to ask her whether she agrees with me on the following point.

Among other things, this budget extends tax credits for the oil and gas industry until 2040. Before this budget was tabled, the tax credits were scheduled to end in 2035. Support for the oil and gas industry, which does not need it, was already costing the public treasury and taxpayers \$83 billion. With this extension, the collective cost will rise to \$100 billion in tax credits for the industry.

Does my colleague agree that this is a prime example of wasteful spending of public funds?

Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I think that there are always many examples of waste in the budget, whether it is this budget or previous ones. We should be ashamed of waste, whether it comes from the Liberal Party or any other party.

I can say that I am really proud to come from Alberta, a province that has greatly contributed to this country. For me, the real shame is that waste exists here. I think that our country needs money for projects across Canada, whether they are in Alberta or in Ontario. It is important to have money for the country and for projects across the country.

I absolutely agree that waste exists. In my view, that is really unfortunate.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech, and I want to congratulate her on the quality of her French. It is always much appreciated.

I want to talk about the media crisis. The Bloc Québécois is very concerned about this issue, particularly this week. There is an easy solution that is within reach and that will not affect taxpayers. I am referring to the much-discussed digital services tax, which the Liberals scrapped this summer in response to threats from Donald Trump.

This tax could easily be turned into a 3% levy on GAFAM, the digital corporate giants. It would help save our local media, restore credibility in regional journalism and support culture.

I want to know what the Conservatives think of this idea from the Bloc Québécois.

Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, I think that the most important thing for us, Conservative and Bloc Québécois members, is that we truly believe that the government wants to control the media. At least, that is top of mind for the Conservatives.

I am from Alberta. My colleague is from Quebec. Those are two provinces with a strong sense of independence. Media control, whether we are from Quebec or Alberta, is something we do not want. This government's history with the media is indeed a big problem. However, for me, the biggest problem is the control that the government wants to have over the media.

[English]

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the budget was initially tabled, Canadians rightly were focused on the big picture: the fact that the government's fiscal plan fudges the numbers and still contains the largest deficit in this nation's history outside the COVID period. Taxpayers have spent more and gotten less in the last 10 years under the Liberals, and that is not changing under the Prime Minister, who is running a record-smashing, \$78-billion deficit and is still leaving Canadians less able to afford basic essentials.

This is the big picture, but today, as Parliament begins debate on the budget implementation act, I want to use this critical opportunity to expose the designs hidden deeper within the budget. I want to talk about jobs, the dignity of work, the esteem we have for different kinds of workers, and the harm that the budget will do to critical sectors of our economy. Before I get into those details, I want to talk about a philosophy of work, because policy, intentionally or not, always must reflect some philosophy.

I believe that all work done by human beings has a special kind of dignity. This is the consequence of a more foundational belief in the universal dignity of human persons. If we understand human beings as having inherent rights and inherent dignity, then we are led from there to the conclusion that the work done by human beings has a special kind of dignity as well because it involves the commitment and effort of a human person.

If a human person is giving a speech, fixing a car, performing a surgery or cleaning a bathroom, in each case that person brings themselves into that activity, with their creativity, effort, desire for excellence, and humanity. Work has dignity, therefore, not because

Government Orders

of the nature of the activity specifically but because it is done by a human person and because it expresses the desire of that person to contribute and to create a better world through their work. Therefore everyone who works can and should take pride in the work they do, as long as they are bringing the fullness of themselves and their human dignity into the work they are doing as the creator or co-creator of some new reality.

This is a clear, coherent and necessary philosophy of work. When done with pride and commitment, work generates all kinds of personal benefits. Work is much more than a means to earn wages; it is the means by which so many people contribute to their communities, create new things, demonstrate their proficiency and creativity, build community and support the people they love. This philosophy of work is understood intuitively by many working people across this country and around the world.

Sadly, however, many modern elites implicitly or explicitly reject this philosophy of work. Instead of valuing all human work, many of our elites have come to esteem different kinds of human work differently, based on self-interested class prejudice. The rampant existence of profession prejudice, prejudice that values different kinds of work differently and that treats people differently based on the jobs they do, has been deeply harmful to our society and to our economy.

Profession prejudice has led authority figures to steer young people towards university to get a good job, even if they are much better suited to and could make more money working in the trades. Authority figures often have an unconscious bias towards their own chosen path, thinking that the road to dignity and meaning necessarily involves following the path they followed. Creating a more equal society does not mean sending everyone to university; it means recognizing the dignity of every person regardless of the work they do.

Profession prejudice has given us profound skill mismatches. It has given us people pursuing programs of study deemed to be more prestigious and more likely to signal their worth to elite society, but then those same people are finding out afterwards that they cannot get a job in their field. Profession prejudice leads elites to make artificial distinctions between what they think are jobs of the future and what they think are jobs of the past, often denigrating physical work and work in resource development. Most often, these predictions about such things turn out to be way off the mark in terms of what is the future and what is the past, yet impressionable young people are often fooled into absorbing these predictions into their own career planning.

The result of all this has been profound mismatches in our labour market: high unemployment coexisting with labour shortages, especially labour shortages in areas where well-paying, secure jobs nonetheless lack the arbitrary social esteem dispensed inconsistently by elites and elite institutions.

Government Orders

Conservatives are committed to fighting profession prejudice, and we will defend a philosophy of work that emphasizes universal human dignity and the universal dignity of work done by human beings.

To the young people watching, I say that when they are picking a career, they should focus on what they like to do and on what the labour market is looking for, and ignore the bad advice of disdainful elites hawking their profession prejudice.

• (1105)

This brings me back to the budget. At a time when many university graduates are already working outside their field of study because they were given bad advice about the needs of the labour market, and at a time when industry is desperate for workers with underappreciated but critical skills, such as those in the trades, this budget doubles down on Liberal profession prejudice and fails to make the transition to a coherent philosophy of work.

Budget 2025 puts well over \$1 billion into helping university research councils try to attract foreign researchers to move to Canadian universities from other countries. Meanwhile, the budget fails to reinstate the apprenticeship grant, a clear broken promise from the Liberal 2025 election platform. Liberals promised to support apprentices, but instead, they have nothing for apprentices directly and nothing for polytechnics, where the majority of apprentices are trained. Liberals pumped an enormous amount of money into attracting foreign researchers for universities at a time when many Canadian post-secondary graduates are unemployed or working outside their field, and they could find nothing for most apprentices despite skill shortages in critical areas in the trades.

It gets worse. Budget 2025 specifically targets career colleges. It attacks what they do, and it withdraws support from students who attend them. Why would the Liberals choose now to attack career colleges? What kind of fit of elite snobbery could motivate a government to target attacks on career colleges at a time when many Canadians need the benefits of targeted vocational programs to get the skills employers are looking for?

Page 217 of the budget announces the intention of the government to make students attending private, for-profit institutions ineligible for student grants, making studies at these institutions inaccessible to many low- and middle-income students. This cut is targeting students at particular institutions, but it is not job-neutral in its implications.

There are many specific kinds of jobs where training is generally not available at public institutions. If someone wants to get a history degree, law degree or women's studies degree, they have got a lot of public institutions to choose from. However, there are many good jobs in areas where there is public and labour market demand, where it just so happens that public institutions have not offered these programs and private, for-profit institutions have filled the gap. This policy change therefore does not just affect institutions; it makes it harder for young people from low- and middle-income backgrounds to pursue studies in certain areas, and it creates critical gaps in these sectors.

This is the pernicious practical outworking of professional prejudice in policy. Let me give a few examples of professions affected by this change.

This week, I met with representatives from BeautyCouncil. It represents a wide variety of hard-working professionals who cut hair, do makeup and generally help others look good. They have got a harder task in some cases than in others. I know how hard these folks work. My barber actually follows me on social media, and when my hair gets too long, he messages me and tells me it is time to come in. He is a great guy.

These are proud professionals, and they benefit from being able to afford good training that often happens to come from private, for-profit institutions. This budget makes it harder for people to access those professions. One can say what they like about Justin Trudeau, but at least he would have known never to attack the beauty industry.

Another profession attacked by budget 2025 is traditional Chinese medicine practitioners. Because this budget proposes to cut student grants for private, for-profit institutions, most students studying acupuncture and other forms of traditional Chinese medicine, and many students studying other kinds of health disciplines, such as chiropractors and massage therapists, would be cut off from financial support.

Many people in and outside the Chinese community want to access various kinds of traditional Chinese medicine practitioners and should be able to do so. This is a good job, and it reflects the dignity of work and the breadth and beauty of Canadian multiculturalism. However, Liberals are making a choice to propose a policy that would make it more difficult for young people to pursue studies in traditional Chinese medicine, especially given the duration of study required.

Why are Liberals attacking Chinese medicine? Why are subsidies available for any university program, no matter how irrelevant they are to the labour market, while they are being withdrawn from in-demand vocational programs that happen to be offered at private institutions? Conservatives recommended the opposite approach. We recommended an alignment between the needs of our labour market and the level of student grants, recognizing the universal dignity of all work and the potential of student grants to help magnify market signals. This is the more hidden agenda of the budget: an attack on vocational programs and on in-demand jobs by a government drowning in profession prejudice and elite snobbery.

• (1110)

I move:

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

"the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, since the bill fails to:

Government Orders

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

• (1115)

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

Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged, in a sense, that the Conservatives realized they needed to move an amendment at this stage. We can compare that to the budget, where the leader of the official opposition forgot to move an amendment. At least they got their timing right for this particular amendment, but I disagree with the amendment. There is no surprise there.

My friend across the way and I had a wonderful experience at the University of Winnipeg. In fact, I think we agreed that we will have another one of these debates. We are looking at Carleton University, and I am thinking January 12 or 13. That way, the university's classes are back a week later. I am hoping he will follow through on this and the two of us can work together.

My question for the member is specific. Does he not believe, given the vote on the budget, that we should continue to move ahead and see if we can get this bill passed into committee sooner as opposed to later?

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disappointed by that question, because after last week, I was sure I convinced the member to see the light and join us in defending everyday Canadians, standing up for fiscal responsibility and fighting back against the pernicious profession prejudice that characterizes this budget.

I am happy to try again to help the member see reason. I look forward to the fight of the century happening every few months at different institutions across the country. I am happy to take the member up on that. I hope, though, that he and other members will think about the specific criticisms I have made on this budget and end their profession prejudice.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a rather pointed question about something that is not in the budget or in Bill C-15, and that is the government's intention to legislate on forced labour and child labour.

In the two previous budgets, the government stated its intention to legislate on this issue, but, at a time when the Prime Minister is trying to thaw relations with China, there is no mention of it in the budget at all. I find that rather fascinating.

The Bloc Québécois introduced Bill C-251, which seeks to reverse the burden of proof so that it is up to importers, rather than customs officers, to prove that their products are not made with forced labour.

I would like to know whether the Conservatives will support the Bloc Québécois's bill. I would also like to know whether my colleague thinks that the government should just take the Bloc's bill and introduce it as a government bill.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly examine the Bloc's bill on this issue. Obviously, this is a new proposal, but I agree that the government has not done what it takes to put an end to forced labour.

I, too, have a lot of objections to the Prime Minister's change in rhetoric on the Chinese government. If the government has decided to stop presenting ideas to put an end to forced labour, it may be because this Prime Minister wants to have a different relationship with the Chinese government, despite the reality of the human rights issue.

• (1120)

[*English*]

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my hon. colleague's perspective as he identified the mismatch between what Bill C-15, the implementation bill of the budget, tries to do and the reality of the economy we are facing right now. He is not alone.

Would he comment on the fact that the PBO has identified only a 7.5% likelihood that the government is going to hit its massive \$78.3-billion deficit? Could it also be that he is identifying a mismatch between what is said in the budget and the probable outcomes of it?

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, that excellent question gives me an opportunity to salute the important work the Parliamentary Budget Officer is doing. He has illustrated how the government has been fudging the numbers. Sadly, when one fudges around, one is going to find out. There are going to be negative consequences from the fudging of numbers.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer is now being targeted by the government because of his work. We should be giving him the mandate and the independence to do the work he needs to do, exposing the abuses of the government.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with your permission and that of the House, I would like to share my time with the member for Rimouski—La Matapédia

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to split his time?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour for me to rise in the House to represent the residents of my riding of Drummond.

I do not know of any parent, any father or any mother, who would boast about feeding two of their children while leaving the other three to go hungry. That, however, is exactly what the Liberals are doing with this budget.

Let us start with the media. An amount of \$150 million is earmarked for CBC/Radio-Canada. To be clear, I am pleased that the government is supporting CBC/Radio-Canada. I have also strongly advocated, for longer than the minister has, for a review of CBC/Radio-Canada's funding model. For a long time now, I have said that Canada should be more closely aligned with other countries that also have a public broadcaster. For a long time now, I have felt that \$33 per Canadian per year to fund a public broadcaster with a territory the size of the one that CBC/Radio-Canada has to cover is peanuts.

Our public broadcaster was forced to look to revenue sources such as advertising and subscription fees, which meant it had to compete with private broadcasters. That worked for many years. The market thrived, and everything was great. One day, however, the American digital giants came along and soon dominated the market, as we have seen in recent years.

The result is that private broadcasters, who were in good shape until quite recently, are now in jeopardy. It has reached a point where massive job cuts keep happening in regions of Quebec and, no doubt, all across Canada as well, because there is no concern for the problems faced by private broadcasters.

Some extremely simple solutions were available, but the \$150 million for CBC/Radio-Canada was nothing more than an expensive Liberal election promise to counter the Conservatives' spring election campaign rhetoric calling for a straight-up cut of the CBC's funding. If the Liberals had truly wanted to help the media, they would not have handed \$150 million to CBC/Radio-Canada just like that, with a promise to talk about it again next year. They would instead have proposed a comprehensive review of our public broadcaster's mandate.

This is what we are asking for. This is what is required. This is what the previous Canadian heritage minister, Ms. St-Onge, proposed, with intelligent and thoughtful solutions that the current minister and government have not even considered. A comprehensive review would have included an evaluation of CBC/Radio-Canada's current funding, and would also have sought to partially or totally free the public broadcaster from its reliance on advertising and subscription fees by providing funding that would support the level of service expected from a public broadcaster. In time, this would have opened up the advertising and subscription market to private broadcasters.

I am talking about really simple measures that the government could have taken to help news media, including measures that are all too familiar to the government because it has heard about them for years from the Bloc Québécois and through testimony from media companies during their many appearances on Parliament Hill.

For instance, electronic media, radio and television newsrooms could be offered the same payroll tax credit for journalists and newsrooms as the payroll tax credit offered to print media and newspapers. That is not something that will affect taxpayers' pocketbooks. This is something that will give news companies, radio, Cogeco, Québecor, Bell, and so forth a big break and ease their financial burden. News production is costly and yields limited profits, and yet it is essential. We have to keep that in mind. The Liberals would have done that if they were really serious about helping the media. They would have implemented this measure, which is readily available and simple, and it would not have had any impact on the budget, which already delivers a historic deficit.

Another gesture of goodwill from the Liberals would have been to abolish the silly tax deduction for ad purchases from American companies. Advertisers that buy ads from web giants online get a tax deduction. That is ridiculous. Simply removing that option would give our local and regional media a bit more breathing room.

Clearly, the Liberals do not care one iota about private broadcasters. They have easy solutions right in front of them, and yet we have an industry that is in crisis and that has been making submissions and sounding the alarm non-stop. Radio stations are shutting down and there are layoffs in the regions, as happened with TVA. My colleague from Rimouski—La Matapédia can speak to that latter. TVA cut 87 jobs in the regions just a few days ago. Now we have a budget that will not do anything for regional radio and the jobs they provide.

• (1125)

The government cannot claim to be concerned about regional and private media with a budget like this one, which offers nothing to help them deal with their current crisis. This sends a message that the government simply does not care about them.

Let us talk a bit about culture. On a more positive note, I am really pleased to see that this budget earmarks money for certain cultural sectors. The minister says with great pride that this is a record budget for culture, with a \$760-million investment in culture. That is a big number, a number to brag about and be proud of. I am happy for our audiovisual industry, as it truly needed this. It is true that funding was included for various sectors, such as for major festivals and events. That is true.

However, we would have preferred to see permanent enhancements, a permanent increase in funding. We would have preferred that over another round of one-time payments, but at least there is some money coming in. Of course, when a person is starving and someone throws them a crust of bread, they are not going to turn their nose up at it. If the government had been serious, it would have offered the permanent boost in funding that the cultural sector was asking for. That is what we would have liked to see.

Government Orders

This will nevertheless be good for the audiovisual industry. It is important for us to be able to produce Canadian stories, with quality productions, eventually exporting them and increasing the return on investment, and in the process gaining recognition around the world with the tools we have now for sharing our culture. I am satisfied with that. However, as I said at the start of my speech, we cannot be proud of feeding only part of our family. When one has responsibilities, one must make sure no one is left behind.

The performing arts such as dance, theatre and orchestral music needed to see an increase in funding for the Canada Council for the Arts. The need was clear, it was great, it had long been expressed, it was known. The Canada Council for the Arts budget needed to be increased by \$140 million in order to meet this demand, a demand that is growing, because costs have exploded, there are more applicants, and there are people who have ideas for productions that would be of interest to the public.

Despite a well-supported request for a \$140-million funding increase to the Canada Council for the Arts, the government thought that a \$6-million increase would satisfy them. I would remind members that while this was happening, they gave Radio-Canada, which had already prepared its budget and presented its five-year plan, \$150 million. The Canada Council for the Arts will be getting only \$6 million, and the government expects that will satisfy theatre companies.

The direct consequence of that is that smaller productions will be shelved. These productions offer a platform for discovering fresh content and emerging artists who might not have access to major theatres, as they often present content that leans toward the unconventional, but is nevertheless deeply compelling. These artists, these emerging productions, shape the future of performing arts, particularly in theatre and dance, as I mentioned earlier. That is negligence, as these productions will literally disappear because the government did not provide adequate funding.

The Bloc Québécois had a good solution, and the solution is still on the table. The digital services tax can be converted into a 3% levy that would be exclusively invested in the cultural and media sector. This would generate \$7 billion over five years, or \$1.5 billion a year. This type of measure would solve many issues. It would not hurt taxpayers because the money would come from digital giants. The government keeps saying no to that. It is a great idea, but the government says it will not implement it just because it did not think of it first.

I am going to conclude on a lighter note by saying from the outset that I have a deep affection for the Scottish people. I have visited Scotland and I got to know its people. I have friends there and I love them, and so I beg them to forgive me for this bit of humour as I finish my speech. The French comedian Jacques Bodoïn was talking about his trip to Scotland where he was asked to try haggis, Scotland's national dish. I will leave it to members to do their own research if they want to know more about the ingredients that go into the dish. At the end of the meal, Mr. Bodoïn was asked what he thought about the dish, and he responded that at first, when the dish was brought to the table, he thought that it was, and I quote, a turd, but after tasting it, he wished it had been one.

This budget is like haggis.

• (1130)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my friend can help me better understand the Bloc's position. The Bloc party ultimately voted against the budget, which would provide so much with respect to benefits, building a stronger Canadian economy and much that is of great substance to the benefit of the Province of Quebec. The Bloc Québécois talked a great deal about the arts program, CBC/Radio-Canada. Surely to goodness its members are aware of the positions the Conservative Party of Canada has taken, for example, getting rid of the CBC, to the detriment of our culture, heritage and arts programs. I wonder if he can explain why the Bloc would prefer to see the Conservatives have an election as opposed to continuing on with the Liberal government.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about CBC/Radio-Canada and about the Conservative position. As I said in my speech, I am in favour of a public broadcaster, but I am also in favour of private media and of news and information that is fair and equitable. I am not in favour of just one broadcaster getting preferential treatment over the others.

We did not agree with the Conservatives' campaign proposal to eliminate funding for CBC/Radio-Canada. However, this measure, which is nothing more than an election promise to give CBC/Radio-Canada \$150 million this year, does not solve the problem in the long term. CBC/Radio-Canada's mandate and funding model need an overhaul. That is not the kind of work that gets done over a weekend. It will take a long time, and it will require serious people to delve into the matter and consult stakeholders, as former minister Pascale Saint-Onge did. She started the work, and the Liberals could have continued it. They could have done the right thing by not neglecting private broadcasters. That is the problem with CBC/Radio-Canada and the government's \$150 million.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. It was well researched, as always. We have different points of view, as he so aptly put it, but that is the beauty of democracy.

I do not want to get into the details of his culinary remark from a few moments ago. I did not catch the name of the dish. Does he think that this dish could also apply to the fact that this government is doing worse than it did under Justin Trudeau? One might have expected a prime minister with an international reputation as a renowned banker to do much better than a drama teacher.

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, we do enjoy the theatre. That said, one would certainly have expected something more rigorous from an expert in economics and finance.

Government Orders

We are somewhat surprised to see so much creative accounting in this budget. There are billions of dollars in spending that the government is treating as assets. We also know that if the same accounting approach were applied to Justin Trudeau's budgets during his years as prime minister, it would appear that he balanced the budget half of the time. There are serious questions about the intellectual honesty and integrity reflected in this budget.

• (1135)

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate my colleague from Drummond for his very thorough work. I enjoyed the touch of humour he added at the end of his speech, and I think it really picks up on what a lot of people are thinking.

Over the years, my colleague has also demonstrated thoroughness in his work on culture and the media, whether national or regional. Right now, we are still faced with a media crisis at the national level and even at the regional level, and it is only getting worse. In Rimouski, in my riding, TVA has cut jobs. In 2023, the Rimouski station had 30 employees. Two years later, only eight remain.

Since 2023, TVA has cut nearly 800 jobs in all. The government tells us day after day during question period that it is investing in the media. Giving \$150 million to CBC/Radio-Canada is all well and good, but this budget contains absolutely nothing for our private broadcasters and television networks.

I would like my colleague from Drummond to clearly lay out the Bloc Québécois's expectations and the consequences of the federal government's inaction and irresponsible behaviour.

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, my colleague has described exactly what our regions and smaller centres are currently feeling: a genuine loss of confidence that this government will save a significant pillar of democracy.

Local media cannot simply be a sort of antenna that transmits what is happening in Montreal, Quebec City and Toronto. They must also have the ability to cover the news, share information, and showcase the reality of the regions they represent. That is what we are in the process of losing. We are losing the personality of our regions, which is so vitally important. What makes Quebec Quebec is the unique character of the regions, each of which is different from every other.

The media is a critical pillar of democracy, but we are losing it because the government is undermining the private broadcasters that provide high-quality news services. This is an absolute tragedy. I do not understand how this government, which claims to be a champion of democracy and the media, can fail to grasp the urgency of the situation.

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to take part in this historic debate. The title of this budget is "Canada Strong". Let me tell the House what I really think about it.

Let us be clear: The budget tabled by this government is, in my opinion, an absolute sham. It contains a record deficit of \$78 billion dressed up with some creative accounting in an attempt to make \$45 billion in fictional investments look like actual spending.

This Prime Minister's track record in his first year is not looking good. He is doubling the deficit left by his predecessor. Like many other members, I would never have dreamed that anyone could make Justin Trudeau look frugal.

The Bloc Québécois had put forward six reasonable budget requests firmly rooted in the needs of our communities. We wanted the government to take care of people, support seniors, increase health transfers, maintain infrastructure, facilitate access to housing, and support families and workers more. There was nothing excessive about what we were asking; these are simply things the government should be doing to meet the basic needs of Quebecers. However, Ottawa said "no" to all of this.

This government not only ignored our priorities, but it also gave up the fight against climate change by abandoning the 2030 targets, by breaking a promise that Justin Trudeau had made with great fanfare to plant two billion trees, and by extending the tax credits for oil and gas companies until 2040, at a cost of \$100 billion. However, the government has no money to take care of the most vulnerable people who are struggling right now. I hope they are tuning in today, and I want to say hello to them.

At first glance, I would say that this budget seems a little conservative. I never thought I would say such thing. We are seeing Conservatives crossing the floor to join the Liberal Party. They are not just crossing the floor because the lunch is better on the other side. They are doing it because the budget has some good things in it that align strongly with the Conservative ideology. It does not matter what party is in power, because the budget does not meet the needs and priorities of Quebecers.

Let us now turn to Bill C-15, which attempts to conceal some of the most troubling measures we have seen in recent years in its 650 pages amending 49 different acts. First, it allocates billions of dollars to introducing new grants for fossil fuels, extending the carbon capture tax credit until 2041—the "new fossil fuel fig leaf", I call it—adding small nuclear reactors to supply heat for bitumen extraction, and opening the door to letting liquefied natural gas qualify for a tax credit that was not designed for such a thing. The government is sending a clear message today that the energy transition can wait, but oil subsidies cannot.

While Quebec is investing in hydroelectricity, wind power, biomass, clean innovations and smart grids, Ottawa is funding yesterday's energy sources. Quebec is making efforts to move forward with a transition, while Ottawa is funding things that set us back.

Government Orders

I am a proud member from the Lower St. Lawrence. I represent the people of Rimouski-Neigette, La Mitis, Matapédia, and Les Basques with dignity and pride. I want to say hello to them. These are strong and united communities with deep roots in their region. However, nothing in this budget or in Bill C-15 truly reflects our realities and priorities. Some of our regional media outlets are floundering. Our infrastructure is aging. There is a housing shortage going on everywhere, from big cities to villages. Our businesses are facing a labour shortage. Our cultural, community and science organizations are struggling to stay afloat. Bill C-15 makes no mention of the Lower St. Lawrence or the people I represent. In our region, this is not merely a theoretical issue; it is a daily reality.

Just last week, TVA announced more job cuts at the Rimouski station, which went from 30 employees to only eight at present. There is only one camera operator to cover a huge geographic area. There used to be three, but from now on, the journalists will also handle filming. A total of 87 positions have been eliminated in Montreal, Sherbrooke, Trois-Rivières, Saguenay and Rimouski, in my riding. A total of 28 jobs were lost in the regions, and approximately 800 have been lost since 2023. This is not just an economic issue; it is an issue of democracy.

• (1140)

When regional news outlets shut down, our realities, our voices and our municipalities vanish from the public discourse. Instead of helping our media outlets, what did the government do? It abolished the digital services tax, a 3% tax on web giants, which would have brought in \$7.2 billion. The Bloc Québécois did not cancel this tax. The Liberals did. They had acknowledged the need for this tax and laid the groundwork. They were scheduled to implement it in July.

Other countries stood their ground. France stood up to Donald Trump, and so did Italy, Spain, and the U.K. Ottawa caved in. By repealing the act, the government deprived itself of strong leverage it could have used in the trade negotiations with Washington. To make matters worse, it is refusing to extend the print media tax credit to electronic media. This is a simple but urgent measure. Ottawa is turning its back on regional news, and our communities are paying the price.

The problems do not end there. Clause 208 of Bill C-15 allows a minister to exempt any company from the application of any federal law, except the Criminal Code, for three years, without vote, without debate, without guardrails. This is a power that should never exist in a democracy. Bill C-15 is Bill C-5 on steroids.

Ottawa has created a new housing agency called Build Canada Homes with a budget of \$11.5 billion. Its French name is “Maisons Canada”, but it started out as “Bâtir Maisons Canada”. No one knows what to call this program anymore. It reminds me of the song *Une main haute* and some of the election campaign speeches. When they are not messing around with program names, they mess around with songs. This Liberal government just makes it up as it goes along.

There are no criteria, no plan, no accountability and, worst of all, no agreement with the Quebec government. This means needless overlap from a parallel federal structure encroaching directly on our jurisdiction. In Quebec, we are not better or worse; we are just dif-

ferent. We have the Société d'habitation du Québec. We did not wait for the federal government to build homes. We took charge ourselves because we believe in our potential, our vision and, above all, our ambitions.

I am going to switch gears now and talk about the clean electricity tax credit. It will benefit oil companies, but mostly, it will benefit the oil- and gas-producing provinces. The credit covers 15% of investments, even in provinces where electricity comes from coal or gas. Contrary to what the government promised, Crown corporations will not even have to demonstrate that the money is reducing costs for consumers. It is a handout in disguise. The government is giving money to corporations that can do with it as they please. No one is even going to check whether it is good for the public. Forget about accountability. Once again, who is paying for this? It is Quebec that is paying, while others cash in at our expense.

It is like the \$814 million that the Liberals stole from us. What a nice gift to hand out in the middle of an election on the backs of Quebecers. We get punished because we are different. We get punished because we are innovators. That is the federal government all over. The federalist parties team up and walk all over us, and we see proof of that again today. We have seen it happen countless times since the Quebec nation came into existence.

There is another issue that we have reason to be up in arms about, and that is the much-talked-about high-speed rail project. The government is unilaterally taking control of this infrastructure project. In the omnibus Bill C-15, the government invokes its declaratory power to make the Quebec-Ontario high-speed rail project an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction. That is a direct infringement on Quebec's jurisdiction. It sets a dangerous precedent that should concern anyone who cares about respect for the division of powers. I hope my Conservative colleagues are listening to this. They respect provincial autonomy, but only when it suits them.

Quebec is doing its part and investing in the future, but Ottawa continues to insist on funding the past: oil companies, federal megastructures and web giants. Bill C-15 does not respond to any of Quebec's priorities. It ignores our needs and weakens our regions. What is more, it infringes on our jurisdictions and diverts our resources to yesterday's industries.

That is why the Bloc Québécois will vote against this bill. Quebec deserves better and so do our regions. The people that I am proud to represent, the people of Rimouski-Neigette, La Mitis, La Matapédia and Les Basques, deserve a government that will finally make them the focus of its decisions.

• (1145)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I disagree wholeheartedly with many of the statements the member across the way put on the record.

Government Orders

One thing I would note, as the member made reference to the ties between Bill C-15 and Bill C-5, is the port of Montreal. There are significant major project investments there. It employs literally tens of thousands of people, both directly and indirectly. If we factor in the rest of Canada, it is well over half a million people who would be affected. There is a major investment in the port of Montreal.

The member also made reference to high-speed rail. As opposed to recognizing the benefits of high-speed rail, he is critical of the government for putting investments into Quebec, to the benefit of the citizens of Quebec.

Why is this particular member putting the interests of the Bloc ahead of those of the citizens of Quebec?

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, it always amuses me to hear my colleague from Winnipeg North speak.

He says that his government makes laws, but then it makes other laws to get around and sidestep the laws it made. What is the point of making laws if they can be sidestepped? That is what the government did with Bill C-5. That is quite clear.

He tells us that his government has some good bills, and yet the government does not want to comply with the laws it has made, so a new law is needed to get around them.

What makes a bill good is when it abides by the law. It is pretty easy to understand. That is what democracy is all about. After that, we can debate, we can amend the laws or make adjustments. In this case, however, the government is trying to get around a dozen laws.

When a government has nothing to hide, it proves that its bills are good and it gets them passed using the processes in place, but that is not what this government is doing right now.

• (1150)

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, although our ridings border each other, it is extremely rare that I agree with my colleague.

Today, I am unfortunately forced to agree with him. In addition to running a deficit of nearly \$80 billion, this budget contains nothing for our regions, absolutely nothing. The government says that this budget includes investments in major infrastructure, but sadly, there is very little for Quebec's regions, particularly the Lower St. Lawrence.

In response to a question last week, the Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions told me that Alstom would benefit. Fine, but where is the money? I have not seen anything yet, and Alstom has not received any federal contracts to my knowledge.

I agree with my colleague and I would like to hear his comments on this. Unfortunately, the Lower St. Lawrence region is completely absent from this budget.

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question and I salute him. If I may make a pun on his name, I would say that he is very “generous” with his comments, and I am humbled by them. This is a red-letter day.

I appreciate the way the member operates. I think we are both clear-headed. We come from the same region. We experience the same situations. I wish to salute the fine people of Témiscouata, whom he represents. I was the one who represented them proudly and with dignity for five years. Of course, while I still carry them with me in my heart, due to the redistribution, they are no longer in my riding. I hope my colleague takes the time to explore this spectacular region and say hello to everyone there.

As I said, there is next to nothing in the budget for the Lower St. Lawrence. My colleague put the question to the minister in English. I do not know whether she does not understand French, whether she understands English better, or whether she is more inclined to follow orders when she gets them in English, but I think we are largely in agreement.

Quebec's regions are completely left out of this budget. Once again, the focus is on objectives that have nothing to do with our realities and our priorities.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague raised an extremely important point. I am surprised to see that members from all parties do not agree with us that a carbon tax rebate was issued even though the tax was never paid. Just before the election campaign, suddenly everyone across Canada received a cheque, except the people in Quebec and British Columbia, because those two provinces do not pay the carbon tax. That tax was never paid, and the rebate was issued before any payment had taken place. That represents \$814 million that Quebec paid to the rest of Canada through its taxes during the federal election.

I would like my colleague to come back to that, because I think that this is unacceptable. The fact that no one in the House is rising to speak out on this is alarming to me.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member has 20 seconds to respond.

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, can we have an emergency debate on this in 20 seconds?

It is so insulting. We get robbed and ripped off, and then we are supposed to say thank you when they give us our own money back. Unbelievable. The Liberals spent \$814 million on an election goody, a vote-buying handout, all from a tax that was never collected. To borrow another member's catchphrase, it is scandalous.

In my view, building a strong Canada does not mean spitting on Quebec, stealing its money and ripping it off every day.

[*English*]

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to speak in support of Bill C-15. It is a financial plan that would deliver meaningful results for Canadians and real progress for Islanders, especially those living in eastern Prince Edward Island, where my riding is located.

Government Orders

The budget builds on the work that our rural, Atlantic and national caucus teams have championed, with investments that strengthen rural communities, support our fishers and farmers, modernize our infrastructure and make life more affordable for families. It is a plan rooted in fairness, opportunity and resilience, values that define both the country and our island way of life.

We introduced a tax cut to lower the first bracket from 15% to 14%, to save nearly 22 million Canadians up to \$840 for a two-income family. The budget also cancelled the federal consumer carbon tax, effective April 1, 2025, immediately lowering fuel costs by about 18¢ a litre. For first-time homebuyers, the budget offers GST relief on new homes. This will make it easier for young Islanders to put down roots and build their future in our communities.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg North today.

Budget 2025 also modernizes our system of delivering support to Canadians. In 2026, the Canada Revenue Agency will start preparing prefilled tax returns for about one million low-income Canadians. Once this is fully implemented, by 2029, over 5.5 million low-income Canadians will receive federal benefits automatically. This will mean a lot to seniors, students and low-income workers in P.E.I. They will not miss out on tax benefits simply because they did not file a tax return.

For island families with school-aged children, the budget makes the national school food program permanent. The program will save families an average of \$800 per year on groceries. It will ensure that no child, not in Souris, not in Montague, not in Mount Stewart, goes to school hungry. The program utilizes help from local island restaurants to deliver meals. Roughly 52% of the food is prepared by local restaurants, and 48% of the meals are produced by program hubs across the island. I commend all the volunteers who manage the nutritious food program.

The budget also recognizes the workers who hold up our communities. The new personal support worker tax credit would provide up to \$1,100 per year to eligible PSWs. This is a significant show of support for those caring for others in our communities.

The budget also introduces a national anti-fraud strategy, with a particular focus on protecting seniors, who are often the most vulnerable to scams and financial abuse. From stronger enforcement to improved public awareness tools, this initiative will help protect the life savings and financial security of island seniors, who have already contributed so much to our communities.

For our youth, \$1.5 billion is invested over three years to expand the Canada summer jobs and student work placement programs to 175,000 positions. This is 45,000 more than the previous year, supporting young islanders and Canadians to gain valuable work experience near their homes.

Housing affordability is one of the most defining challenges of our time, and rural Atlantic communities feel it deeply. That is why the budget launched Build Canada Homes, an \$11.5-billion investment in new funding over five years. Build Canada Homes will drive the development of affordable housing, provide flexible financial tools and mobilize the construction sector. Budget 2025 al-

so commits to indigenous housing and infrastructure for first nations.

I would like to highlight the apartment construction loan program announcement in August. The program is already supporting new builds in eastern P.E.I. I was proud to host the housing and infrastructure round table in Stratford with the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, where island builders, municipal leaders and non-profits discussed innovations, barriers and opportunities to accelerate construction in P.E.I.

● (1155)

To meet the growing demand for workers in construction, housing, energy and transportation, we must build stronger apprenticeship pathways. That is why budget 2025 would continue the government's work to expand skilled trades training, strengthen apprenticeship supports and help more young people enter Red Seal and construction careers. Islanders know the demand is here. Housing projects, infrastructure builds, new community facilities and clean energy initiatives all require a skilled workforce. The message is clear: Islanders want to build, and the budget would give them the support to do it.

Rural infrastructure is the foundation of strong communities. Budget 2025 would establish the build communities strong fund, with \$51 billion over 10 years. This is one of the largest infrastructure investments in Canadian history. Of this, \$5 billion would be dedicated to the health infrastructure fund, which is essential for modernizing hospitals and clinics across the region.

Budget 2025 lists support for one particular project in my riding: the SeaRoots Alliance wellness centre in Souris. It is a transformative community-led project that would improve the well-being of families across eastern P.E.I. and would support the next generation of community builders. Other key community projects in my riding that I hope will gain support through this program are the Stratford community campus, the TCAP Family Aquatic and Fitness Center in Montague and the replacement of the Kings County Memorial Hospital, which dates back to the 1970s.

Government Orders

Within this beautiful and sustainable environment of eastern P.E.I., the economy is powered by the sea and the soil. The budget recognizes our rural industries and would support them during a time of global uncertainty. Starting in the 2024-25 fiscal year, there was \$463 million dedicated to repairs and maintenance of small crafts and harbours. There would be \$109 million for the AgriStability program in 2025-26, and we have pledged \$75 million over five years for AgriMarketing, to help island food products reach new markets.

Diversification is essential. We are actively expanding new trade corridors and markets so that island agriculture and seafood can reach global customers in Asia, Europe and beyond. Islanders produce world-class food. We are Canada's food island. Through Farm Credit Canada, the new trade disruption customer support program would provide \$1 billion in new lending to help farmers and food processors weather global instability. These investments build on decisions made in July by our Prime Minister to cut Confederation Bridge tolls from over \$50 to \$20 and reduce the Atlantic ferry costs by 50%. Did members know that 400,000 passengers used the Wood Islands-Pictou ferry in 2025? Since fares were reduced last August, passenger volumes have increased by over 25%, providing a major boost for tourism and small businesses throughout eastern P.E.I.

Budget 2025 would invest \$6.6 billion over five years to strengthen Canada's defence manufacturing base through the defence industrial strategy, creating new economic opportunities in Atlantic Canada. For those who have served, Veterans Affairs Canada, located in Charlottetown, would receive \$185 million over four years plus \$40 million ongoing to streamline disability benefits and modernize service delivery so that veterans receive the support they deserve.

Budget 2025 would also invest \$4 million over four years to support National Acadian Day and \$20 million over four years to enhance Canada Day celebrations nationwide. In a province with deep Acadian roots and proud traditions, these investments would help celebrate the culture and identity that bind us together.

None of this happened by accident. The budget reflects the relentless advocacy of our Atlantic caucus, which ensured that rural voices were not only heard but acted upon. We secured investments in housing and health care. We defended the interests of farmers and fishers. We pushed for relief for families and seniors. We championed the infrastructure for rural and coastal communities. For Islanders, especially in eastern P.E.I., this budget would mean better connectivity, stronger communities and a brighter future.

Islanders have always believed in hard work, fairness and looking out for one another. Budget 2025 reflects those same values.

• (1200)

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member from across the way is genuine in his concern for the residents of the island, but the budget does not contain any provisions at all for the retraction of the clean-fuel standard or the industrial carbon tax, which both add significant cost for the people he represents. What are his feelings about that?

Kent MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I know our government needs to support trade diversification. If we want to do that, we have to

maintain a strategy to meet our climate change commitments, and the industrial carbon tax is part of that strategy. Many of our global trading partners will be receptive to new trade deals if we remain committed to addressing climate change.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my colleague heard my speech earlier or what we have been saying for days now about the crisis in the media, which has been going on for years. This government is well aware of it.

Private media outlets and private broadcasters are complaining about this budget, saying that there is nothing in it for them, even though they asked for very simple, minor measures such as getting rid of the shameful deduction for advertising purchased from American companies. This measure makes no sense. They also asked for the same privilege as print media, such as newspapers, with a tax credit to support newsroom payroll costs. There is nothing like that in the budget. These measures would have had no impact on taxpayers' wallets.

I would like to know whether my colleague agrees that these measures could easily be implemented now, even though the budget has been tabled, and whether he is in favour of the measures we are proposing.

• (1205)

[*English*]

Kent MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with my Bloc colleague across the way.

I have heard the culture minister speak, even this week in question period, and we talk about an arts and culture investment of \$700 million. We talk about media investment of \$150 million to media outlets like CBC/Radio-Canada.

Our government is addressing the media and arts and culture, particularly in the province of Quebec.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, listening to the member for Cardigan talk about Prince Edward Island, members can tell that he is a very strong advocate, particularly for the eastern side. He made reference to the SeaRoots Alliance, which is a very strong organization from what I understand. It caters to a lot of people.

I wonder if he could share what budget 2025 does for the island, particularly for the SeaRoots Alliance.

Kent MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 is about building communities strong, and the SeaRoots Alliance will have a new wellness centre in the town I grew up in, Souris, P.E.I. I played hockey in the old arena and the arena before that, so that is dating me very well.

This is an example of community creating new community builders. Those in group that spearheaded the SeaRoots Alliance, which has applied for funding for this project, are 30- to 40-year-olds with young families in Souris. They inspire me to believe that we have a future in Canada. They believe in Canada, and they believe in their community.

Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the industrial carbon tax and the clean-fuel standard. I do not know if the member realizes the significance of their cost and what they are doing to add to the cost of living for such basic things as groceries and transportation.

Does the member have no concern for the residents of P.E.I. about the increased costs and the increased number of people who have to go to food banks just to get by?

Kent MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, of course I am concerned about affordability in P.E.I.

This budget puts lots of measures in that would address affordability. The other big thing it would do is invest in our communities, which is going to create well-paying jobs throughout the community, address unemployment issues and give our youth a future with new, successful careers.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am hoping to be able to address what I believe are three or four really important issues.

The first is the issue of health care. I believe that the Prime Minister's and the government's commitment to health care meets the needs Canadians have from their federal government. There are things within the budget that show we understand and appreciate, as a national government, the importance Canadians put on health care.

Let me give a couple of tangible examples. One is that there is a \$5-billion commitment over a number of years for capital infrastructure. That means a great deal when we think of, for example, capital expenditures in different jurisdictions. I for one think of Seven Oaks General Hospital.

The commitment provides a pot of money that is going to assist provinces in building our health care infrastructure, which includes hospitals. For me, that is a priority, whether it is upgrading emergency services or intensive care units, or just having a hospital, period. I believe that capital infrastructure for health care is noteworthy.

I also want to recognize that the budget reinforces the importance of, and the commitment from the Government of Canada to, ensuring that we continue to have a dental care program and a pharmaceutical program. We also have a 5% increase to the equalization com-

Government Orders

mitment over the next number of years so provinces have a sense of how much is coming through things like the health care transfers. There is a significant block of money, going into billions of dollars, to emphasize the importance of mental health and to emphasize the importance of long-term home care services.

These are the types of things that I know the constituents I represent and, I would ultimately argue, all Canadians, have an interest in, and the budget and the bill would be delivering on that.

On the issue of crime, another important issue I have attempted to raise on numerous occasions, I look to the Conservatives. We have a pledge from the Prime Minister of Canada, through the last election, to deliver on bail reform for Canadians. The federal government does have a role to play in this. All levels of government have to deal with the crime taking place in our communities, and the federal government needs to step up. The Prime Minister and the Liberal caucus have done just that, and we are looking to the Conservatives to look at the legislation before them, in particular Bill C-2 and Bill C-14.

In the last couple of days, the Conservatives have talked a lot about extortion, but that is all it has been: talk. We want the Conservative Party of Canada to ensure that Bill C-2 and Bill C-14 pass the House of Commons, especially Bill C-14, which deals specifically with bail reform legislation and has the support of law enforcement agencies, municipalities, provinces and all the other stakeholders. It is time for the Conservatives to stop talking about it and serving their own political interests, and for them to get the legislation passed before the end of the year.

Another issue I want to spend time on is one that the Prime Minister and every Liberal member of Parliament have recognized as the primary one coming out of the election: the issue of Trump, trade and tariffs. As a nation, we need to recognize the value of economic security into the future, and the best way we can achieve that is to increase exports beyond the U.S. border. The government today is committed to doubling our exports outside the U.S.A. in the next 10 years, and that is the reason the Prime Minister is travelling and is meeting with world leaders to talk about Canada's wanting to expand its trade.

● (1210)

Let us take a look at the hard numbers. Canada's population makes up 0.5% of the world's population, but we contribute to 2.5% of world trade. Canada is a trading nation. Never before have we had such a proactive prime minister in searching out trade opportunities with a mission to build Canada strong and to look at ways in which we can actually double our exports in the next 10 years. That means jobs, which are so critically important when we talk about affordability. We want good-quality, middle-class jobs.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister is committed to travelling the world in order to increase exports. That is something that follows the commitment he made to bring in one Canadian economy so we can take down trade barriers within Canada. Then we brought in legislation to that effect, and we piled on to that the idea of getting major projects approved here in Canada. There has been significant movement in that area, not only in taking down trade barriers but also in looking at labour mobility in Canada, in dealing with major projects and in building a consensus.

That is what is critically important: building a consensus in developing major projects. Whether it is LNG in B.C., copper in Saskatchewan, nuclear power in Ontario or the advancement of major projects in Atlantic Canada and in my home province of Manitoba, in particular, the port of Churchill, these are initiatives that will make a difference for Canadians, all with the idea of building Canada strong.

How we build Canada strong, making it the strongest of the G7 countries, is by being prepared to invest in Canadians and in Canada's infrastructure. That is exactly what the current budget does, and that is why it was disheartening and disappointing to see the unholy coalition of the Bloc and the Conservatives voting against the budget that provides the type of programming Canadians need at this time. I hope they will revisit it; they can do that by looking at Bill C-15 and supporting it as good, sound budgetary legislation, because it will make a difference for every region of our country.

We are investing in children and in supporting seniors. We are investing in apprenticeship programs and in supporting summer youth programs. There is a great deal in the budget, investing in real people in all regions, while at the same time investing in Canada's infrastructure. This is absolutely critical in terms of building Canada strong.

The Prime Minister has an incredible background, an economic background. He understands how an economy works. The Liberal caucus is highly motivated to do exactly what we told Canadians we would do: build a stronger, healthier economy.

With respect to the trade agreement with the United States, we are not going to settle because the Conservative leader is jumping up like a jelly bean, saying that we want a trade agreement. We are not going to capitulate. We are going to take the time necessary in order to get the best possible deal for Canadians. If that takes more time, we will take the time, because getting the right deal for Canadians is our priority when it comes to the Canada-U.S. agreement.

On the issue of the deficit, I would point out that we have the second-lowest deficit-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We have the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We are one of two countries in the G7, which includes Japan, France, Germany, Italy, the U. K. and the U.S.A., that actually has a AAA credit.

We are on the right track. Everyone should get behind the legislation. They should get behind the budget and vote for it.

● (1215)

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is my friend, although I disagree with just about everything he said. He is a great defender of Liberal propaganda.

What the member failed to mention is that the Prime Minister made a promise that the deficit would not exceed \$62 billion. It is at \$78 billion. It is indeed a generational budget, because it is adding generational debt for our children and our grandchildren, which they are going to have to worry about paying back someday. What he does not realize, or at least talk about, is that we are going to be spending more on servicing the debt than we are spending on health care transfers and our military. All these things contribute to inflation, which is going to make affordability an even bigger problem here in Canada.

What does the member think about those issues that he did not talk about?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, in the last few seconds of my speech, I did have the chance to bring it up, and I am more than happy to reinforce it. In terms of the deficit, we have the second-lowest deficit of the G7 countries, which include Japan, France, Germany, Italy, the U.K. and the U.S.A. With respect to the debt-to-GDP ratio, we have the lowest. At the end of the day, we have a AAA credit rating. We are one of two G7 countries that have a AAA credit rating.

If I had enough time, I would talk about the real dollar value of today's deficit compared to the deficit in 2009, when Harper was the prime minister. We are actually doing better than Harper did.

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have to give credit where credit is due. The member for Winnipeg North is definitely entertaining, and when it comes to drinking the Liberal Kool-Aid, that member is second to none. Someone should make a T-shirt with his face on it.

Having said that, I do respect his opinions and his point of view. That is what democracy is all about. I accept that we can have different opinions and express them respectfully. I appreciate that about the member for Winnipeg North.

Still, I would like to draw his attention to something he himself said earlier. He said he was surprised to see the Conservatives and the Bloc Québécois join forces. He even talked about an "unholy coalition". That is a bit rich, but if the Bloc Québécois and the Conservatives are on the same page for once, is that not a reason for the Liberals to be concerned and to wonder about the budget they tabled?

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that is why I asked the Bloc member the question I did earlier. When we really stop and think about it, the Bloc members talk a great deal about the arts community and how distinct the province of Quebec is. With regard to support for the arts community and what the commitment of the Liberal Party and the Prime Minister has been toward the development and promotion of the arts community, whether it is Radio-Canada or the CBC, the Liberals are far more supportive than the Conservatives have ever been historically and, I would suggest, would be in the future.

However, the Bloc members were quite prepared to have an election called. Why would they want an election when the government is delivering so much for the people of Quebec and for all Canadians? That is why it is a bit confusing sometimes and why I might sometimes say they are the unholy alliance: I do not fully understand why the Bloc would want the Conservatives to be the government of Canada.

I can assure the member that the 44 members of the Liberal Quebec caucus are strong advocates for the province of Quebec.

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, could the member for Winnipeg North address our building Canada strong and how it is going to improve electricity to all regions of the country?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think that when we look at building Canada strong and what it has to offer, we see that we are talking about energy, streets, bridges, hospitals and community centres. The government recognizes that to have healthy Canadian infrastructure, we have to be prepared to invest in it. By doing that, we are creating opportunities to enhance trade and so forth.

[Translation]

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share my time with my dear colleague from Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

It is always very interesting and very important to rise in the House, especially during the budget debate, because as we know, the tabling of the budget is a crucial moment in the history of any parliament.

I have received a lot of comments and talked a lot with people in Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis. I will not be telling members anything new when I say that my constituents are extremely worried. They have concerns, and they are also disappointed by what the Liberal government has presented. The only new thing about this government is the name of the Prime Minister. Everyone can see that it is the same government using the same approach, with the same people who were there under Mr. Trudeau.

The dynamic is still the same as it was during the past 10 years of out-of-control spending and not being able to table a balanced budget. Quite frankly, given the context and the situation Canada is in right now, the Conservative members were keeping an open mind and were paying very close attention. We were also worried about the current geopolitical situation, and we still are. We were eager to see what the current government was going to table.

All I can say is that what was tabled is totally contradictory and incompatible with the Conservatives' DNA, which is why we could not support this budget. I personally find it troubling that the members opposite did not rely on the wisdom of the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, currently the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry. He is one of my former colleagues from when I was in the Quebec cabinet. He once said that a balanced budget is a way to establish the government's credibility and financial stability.

Perhaps he should have been the one preparing the budget that was just tabled in the House. As members will recall, this budget was 18 months overdue. Canada was flying blind because it did not have a budget. The Liberals have used big adjectives to describe this budget, including the word "generational". I would say that the only generational thing about this budget is the debt it places on our children's shoulders.

I want to talk about the deficit. The member for Winnipeg North said that the Liberals did what they said they would do. That is false. That is completely false. They said the deficit would be \$40 billion. That was under the former finance minister, Ms. Freeland.

During the election campaign, they announced that the deficit would be \$62 billion. Even that was unacceptable to us. Now they have tabled a budget with a \$78-billion deficit. That is an extra \$16 billion. Can someone explain to me how we got to this point? That is not all. They are tabling a budget with \$90 billion in new spending. Does anyone know how much that represents per family? That is an additional \$5,400 per household.

This government's reflex to constantly spend money it does not have is detestable. In contrast, we Conservatives always remember where the government's money comes from. It comes from taxpayers' pockets.

If Mr. Trudeau's Liberals had not spent money like it grows on trees, we would have money right now, money that could be allocated to national defence to keep our country safe. A member asked a question earlier: Is it possible to spend more than Mr. Trudeau's government did? We never thought we would be able answer yes, but it is possible and it is happening now.

• (1225)

Now let us talk about the debt. Those of us on this side of the House are very concerned about the debt, as are our constituents. We hear a lot about it in our ridings. Under the Liberals, the debt has more than doubled. It went from \$687 billion to \$1.35 trillion. I do not even know how many zeroes that is. It is a very big number; it is huge. That is our current debt.

Debt servicing is a simple concept. It is the interest we pay on money we borrow. We certainly are borrowing a lot these days, because Canada is spending like there is no tomorrow. Debt servicing costs \$50 billion. Believe it or not, that is more than the provincial health transfers.

Government Orders

Earlier on, the member for Winnipeg North was yelling about health care services and infrastructure. He said that his government was going to make investments. The \$60 billion that will be spent on servicing the debt in 2026-27, which is just a few weeks away, is money that will not be spent on health care. It is money that will not be spent on services for Canadians. It is \$60 billion flung out the window. That is more money than the provinces receive in health transfers. It is more than all of us combined pay in GST.

Every time we go to the pharmacy or buy a pair of winter boots, we pay GST. Every dollar of that is going toward paying down the debt. From the moment they let out their first cry, every newborn owes \$30,000 in debt servicing charges. That is today's reality; it is as simple as that. The Liberals are the ones who got us into this mess. They spent money they did not have. For 10 years, they spent like there was no tomorrow.

One would have thought that the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, who is a conscientious Liberal member, could have influenced the Minister of Finance and National Revenue. They did not listen to common sense. They did not listen to the people. That is how they operate. Today, we are left without one penny to defend our borders. On top of that, they have to borrow on the markets at exorbitant rates.

Despite the criticism, the Liberals have convinced themselves that everything is fine, that life is beautiful, and that everyone is in a good mood. That is not true. The criticism against them is unanimous, whether it comes from the English-language press or the French-language press, from Fitch Ratings or the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Is there anyone in this country more credible than that? Fitch Ratings in New York said that Canada's financial situation is poor, that the overspending is too high, and that it is not certain if it can maintain the current rating. The Liberal member spoke earlier about the AAA rating. Honestly, that is laughable; it is impossible. That is not coming from me; it is coming from the rating agencies. The Parliamentary Budget Officer told the truth so much that they started writing a job posting to replace him, because he is not on their side. Is that true or false?

We on this side of the House are disappointed. We are the voices of our communities. The Conservatives are not the only ones on our side. There are also people who think critically and who are able to provide important and credible analysis. These people are telling us that this makes no sense. That is why we did not vote in favour of this budget.

• (1230)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my previous answer I provided what I believe are sound numbers, which say very clearly what Canada's deficit and debt situation is compared to the other G7 countries in the world, which are the most influential or powerful countries. Canada is positioned quite well on the debt issue. We are number one in the G7 and number two in the deficit situation. We actually have a AAA credit rating. We are only one of two countries in the G7 that has a AAA credit rating.

Does the member not see that there is a time when we should be investing in Canada's infrastructure and its people? Why does the Conservative Party not want to see a government that invests in Canadians?

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said earlier. If the government had not spent money like it grows on trees for 10 years, we would have money to invest in infrastructure. We would have money right now to protect our borders.

I am going to read some of what Fitch Ratings wrote about the budget. It said: "[P]ersistent fiscal expansion and a rising debt burden have weakened [the government's] credit profile and could increase rating pressure over the medium term." Fitch also wrote that "the Canadian government has a track record of upward deficit revisions", and added, "Given that these rules are non-binding and prior versions have been ignored, federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration."

That is not coming from me. That is from Fitch, a New York ratings agency.

• (1235)

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her passionate speech. She is obviously listening to her constituents. There is no denying that life has become increasingly unaffordable. Mothers are struggling to put food on the table and families are suffering.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer and Fitch Ratings say that the situation is problematic. Can the member tell us what she is hearing about this in her community?

Dominique Vien: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the member asked me this question. Food banks have never been busier. I believe that the number of monthly visits to food banks is now 2.2 million, which is double what it was in 2019. That is just off the top of my head. These are not the unemployed; these are working people. The people who are ending up at food banks are people who have jobs, who get up in the morning and go to work.

My office called a food bank in my riding. They told us that they cannot keep up. They said that demand keeps rising. Just this week, six new families came in and 20 new families have registered since mid-September. Available supplies are down, with a decrease of \$82,000 compared to last year. There was no meat in the Moisson Beauce delivery this week.

What will those who rely on Essential des Etchemins eat this week?

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is rather funny to hear the Conservatives say today that they are not in favour of the budget because the deficit is too high. I would like to remind my colleagues that Quebec's motto is "Je me souviens", or I remember.

Government Orders

In 2009, the Harper government ran a record \$55.6-billion deficit. If we enter that number into a calculator and adjust for inflation, we get about \$78 billion. That is roughly the same amount as today's deficit.

The Conservatives ran up deficits for six consecutive years, including the deficit of 2009. Now they are telling us that the deficit is too big and that they do not support the budget. My colleague says it is not in the Conservative DNA. I would like her to explain that to us today. When we see Conservative members crossing the floor to join the Liberals, is that not because this is a Conservative budget?

Dominique Vien: Mr. Speaker, there needs to be some context. When my colleague shares information, he should provide the full context. I would like to remind my colleague of something that he may not remember, since he is a young man. In 2008, there was a global financial crisis.

[*English*]

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the budget today.

Just before I start, I want to give a shout-out to my brother Larry. He made me this pen. He has made me a few other pens. He lives in Chilliwack. I just want to recognize my brother for being a good brother over the years.

Let us get to the budget. I remember when the Prime Minister said he would spend less and invest more. He meant that in reference to Justin Trudeau, but his budget does the exact opposite. As the recent report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer discovers, it spends billions more and invests billions less than the Prime Minister promised just months ago.

I think we all remember when he was running to be leader of the Liberal Party and in essence running to be the Prime Minister. This is from February 19. He said, out of his own mouth, "The essence of this is to spend less, and invest more." This is right from the Prime Minister's mouth.

This is confirmed by *The Globe and Mail*, one of the Prime Minister's and Liberals' favourite newspapers. It says, "The former governor of the Bank of Canada and Bank of England criticized the government of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau for spending too much." We all know that, do we not? "Total federal spending has jumped by about 9 per cent on average since the Liberals took power in 2015 and federal workforce grown by 40 per cent". This is right out of the Prime Minister's mouth: "It is clear that the federal government is spending too much." He also said, "At the same time Canada as a whole is investing too little."

That was the promise he made to many Canadians across the country. A lot of voters took him at his word, and it seems that just a few months after that promise was made, things changed quickly.

How does Mark Carney spend more and invest less?

• (1240)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to remind the member that he cannot use the name of the the Prime Minister in the House and should refer to him by his title.

I will let the member continue.

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

How does the Prime Minister spend more and invest less? Even Justin Trudeau, in his last budget, projected his deficit for that year would be \$39.8 billion. He ended up spending \$61.8 billion just before leaving.

The Prime Minister led us to believe that it would be easy to do, and many believed that based on the out-of-control spending of Justin Trudeau. How could the Prime Minister make any mistake by reducing the budget? We all knew that Trudeau was an out-of-control spender. We knew the government was an out-of-control spending government, so we thought that it would be a relatively easy task. However, as we have all seen, the deficit will be \$78.3 billion, and we have learned that it is likely to be worse. We have seen that over and again with the Liberals. It is a major broken promise and not a good sign considering that promises were made just a few short months ago.

The Prime Minister broke even more of the promises he made just months ago. Do members remember the fiscal anchors he was going to adhere to? The fiscal anchor that he promised during the election he would adhere to was the debt-to-GDP ratio, but he raising it. He promised to spend less, but he is spending \$94 billion more, which is costing each household another \$5,400 per year.

If \$78 billion in deficit spending is not bad enough, the Prime Minister is also padding the number to hide operational spending as capital spending. This is from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's recent report. His new definition of capital spending "is overly expansive" and "expands beyond the current treatment in the Public Accounts and international practice based on the System of National Accounts (SNA), such as that adopted by the United Kingdom".

After using a more accepted definition, the PBO found that capital investment spending was 30% lower than the Liberals claimed. That is where the \$94-billion amount comes from. It is a \$94-billion difference. Even the promises the Prime Minister made are false. In other words, his investments are much lower than he promised, \$94 billion less.

Furthermore, the PBO found that the Prime Minister will not even balance the operational budget over the next five years. It is another fiscal anchor abandoned by the Prime Minister. That is a lot of broken promises in a few short months, and that is after he abandoned the Liberals' previous fiscal anchor of reducing the federal debt-to-GDP ratio. The PBO found that the debt-to-GDP ratio will be even higher than in the last economic update and that Canada "is no longer projected to be on a declining path over the medium term."

Government Orders

It is a scary direction we are headed in. The PBO had previously warned in September that Canadians could be paying more for debt if the Liberals tried to change accounting standards. We know they have.

In the Financial Post on November 18, two days ago, was this article: “PBO calling out the federal government’s fiscal approach should raise red flags for all of us”. Indeed it should. It states:

[The] Prime Minister...promised a new budgeting framework during the Liberal Party leadership campaign when he said he would separate the federal budget into an “operating budget” and a “capital budget,” with the operating budget being balanced within three years [total].

Tricks such as this are a blatant attempt to baffle people by transferring many day-to-day expenditures from an overall budget to a capital budget and crow that you are “investing.” The key to making it work is to ensure that the definition of capital is so broad that you can transfer amounts easily into the capital budget.

Again, if members and Canadians out there do not want to take my word for it, they can take the Parliamentary Budget Officer’s word.

I think Canadians are wondering what the cost is to them, because they hear big numbers, billions and trillions. What is the true cost of the Prime Minister right out of the gate? He will add \$321.7 billion in new money to the federal debt over the next five years.

An hon. member: Unbelievable.

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable, as my colleague just said.

It is more than twice the \$154.4 billion that Justin Trudeau would have added over the same period. Do members remember the quote at the start, that the Prime Minister was going to be better than Justin Trudeau? Well, here we are.

• (1245)

This budget adds another \$10 million to our debt every hour. Under the new Prime Minister, federal debt is now \$1.3 trillion, and interest on the debt will be \$55.6 billion for 2025-26. That is more than the Canada health transfer of \$54.7 billion. It is incredible. It is also more than the GST revenue the government collects across the country, which is \$54.4 billion and amounts to \$3,360 per Canadian household.

The Prime Minister said out of his own mouth that the previous prime minister was an irresponsible spender, which is why he lost his job in the first place. We saw that with an out-of-control government. Many of its members are still here, but that is why he lost his job and we all know that.

The current Prime Minister won under the premise that he was going to spend less and invest more than the previous prime minister. Those are some pretty significant promises he has already broken. I will say this, and I am sure the members across the way will have a problem with it: He is indeed out of control, and we definitely need a much more financially responsible prime minister. A future prime minister, I would say, is the current opposition leader.

Author Kim Moody gives a great summary of the Prime Minister’s budget: “It’s a clever performance, but, at its core, it’s a deceptive trick, one that trades transparency for theatrics and leaves Canadians poorer for having believed it.” That goes out to all the

people who voted for the Prime Minister. “Government spending—capital or operating—increases government debt in the same way.”

I would call on voters and Canadians out there to note this: The Prime Minister sold them the bill of goods that he was going to spend less and invest more. He is doing the exact opposite.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the member said the previous prime minister “lost his job”. It was the leader of the Conservative Party who lost his job. Do members remember there was a by-election during the summer?

Let me give a quote from the IMF, a world organization of over 175 countries:

Both Germany and Canada recognize that in this very testing time, they need to use their fiscal space.... In the case of Canada, the Canadian authorities have been very decisive to take action in the context of changing relations with their main trading partner. And one of these actions is indeed to reform—modernize the budget framework....

I am not sure where the member is coming from.

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I will just reiterate the Prime Minister’s own words. Members should remember that he ran on this in February of this year, just a few short months ago. I will say the title of the article: “[The Prime Minister] promises to spend less, invest more to stimulate economy if he wins Liberal leadership”.

He is actually spending more and investing less than the previous prime minister, after he said he was going to do a better job. Those are the facts. I wish members over on the Liberal side would stick to the facts.

• (1250)

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting to see all my Conservative colleagues getting all worked up about the Liberal budget today and saying how bad they think it is. I could get caught up in that too, because I do not think much of it is good.

Unlike the Conservatives, we have the benefit of being consistent. This week, when we voted on the budget, we were surprised to see that two Conservative members were hiding, waiting to see whether the budget would pass, before coming back to the House to state that they had had technical problems related to the vote.

My question for my colleague is this. Despite everything that the Conservatives say is wrong with the Liberal budget, how is it that they did the math and found a way to make sure it would pass? Is it because, as everyone says, this is ultimately a Conservative budget?

Government Orders

[English]

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, the member's last couple of words were that this is a Conservative budget. I would take issue with that, as this is not a Conservative budget. A Conservative budget would not add \$321.7 billion over the next five years to our federal debt. We are already at \$1.3 trillion. I have made a video just to show the amount of money that is, which future generations will have to pay for. The interest alone is over \$50 billion per year.

It is ridiculous. This not a Conservative budget. We need a Conservative budget.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. colleague is my neighbour to the north. We share one of the largest cities as it is in both of our ridings, and I have deep respect for him. He is a true friend.

My hon. colleague and I have talked about the generational budget that the government has just introduced. It is generational because of the debt that it is heaping onto the shoulders of our families and future generations. I want to share this with everybody who is listening, the packed gallery here and the 12 people watching on TV. The fact of the matter is that today we are spending more to service our debt than we are in health care transfers to our provinces and in developing, sharing or transferring to our provinces to deal with the opioid crisis and the mental health crisis.

What would our hon. colleague's thoughts be on that?

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Cariboo—Prince George has a couple of constituents in the gallery today who are watching us as we speak.

This is a real issue. I would challenge Canadians to answer how many of them actually have a family doctor. How many think the current health care system is doing great? If we had a show of hands, I bet we would not see a whole bunch of hands going up.

The government has been in place for the last 10 years. It has really run Canada into the ground, and that needs to change.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go back to resuming debate, I would just remind members that we cannot make reference to persons in the gallery.

Resuming debate, the hon. President of the Treasury Board.

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my amazing colleague, the hard-working member of Parliament, the hon. member for Davenport.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of Bill C-15, the budget 2025 implementation act, No. 1. Our government has been focused on bringing down costs and creating new opportunities for Canadians. The first thing we have done as a government is to cancel the divisive consumer carbon price, reducing, as a result, gas prices by approximately 18¢ per litre in most provinces and territories while strengthening industrial carbon prices so that we can continue our moral and economic duty to combat climate change. We have also cut taxes for 22 million Canadians, saving a family of two up to \$840 per year.

In budget 2025, we are making generational investments in our Canadian Armed Forces, in infrastructure and in housing. We are building Canada strong. We are also creating new career opportunities for young Canadians. We are launching a youth climate corps and are providing 175,000 opportunities through Canada summer jobs, the horizontal youth employment and skills strategy and the student work placement program in 2026-27.

The bill is delivering measures to make life more affordable for Canadians. We know, for example, that the digitalization in the financial sector has brought many benefits for consumers. At the same time, we know that consumers who remain reliant on legacy financial products and services may be missing out on these benefits and getting left behind.

Access to cheque fund rules are now over a decade old and have not kept pace with cost of living increases or technological advances. That is why budget 2025 proposes to amend the Bank Act to raise the first amount of immediately available deposited cheque funds from \$100 to \$150. That means removing the timing distinction between funds deposited in-person and via other ways. We are reducing the number of days banks may hold deposited cheque funds, which will include raising the current value threshold of \$1,500, below which shorter cheque hold periods would apply. This would also apply the changes to trust and loan companies.

Once again, Bill C-15 would make this change a reality. That is not the only way that the bill would improve financial services to help Canadians manage their money.

Consumer-driven banking refers to a secure framework that lets Canadians and businesses share their financial data with the approved service providers of their choice. This framework would give consumers greater control over their data. It would also promote a competitive and innovative financial sector that strengthens Canada's position in the global digital economy.

● (1255)

The goal of Canada's consumer-driven banking framework is to promote competition and innovation in the financial sector, improve financial outcomes for Canadians and ensure that consumers can share their data securely. In other countries, regulated frameworks have proven effective at achieving accessibility and supporting new financial service providers and business models.

Government Orders

At the same time, we know that the absence of a secure framework means that about nine million Canadians currently share their financial data by providing their confidential banking credentials in a process known as screen scraping. These consumers face increased security, liability and privacy risks, and may be left without resources if something goes wrong. Our consumer-driven banking framework will address these risks by using application programming interfaces, or APIs, a type of technology that provides a more secure communication connection between entities.

Giving Canadians greater controls over their financial data would open the door to new financial products and greater choices between providers, which would create a more dynamic financial sector and productive economy. Unlocking these new opportunities will lead to improved financial decision-making, lower costs, and more tailored products and services for consumers.

Bill C-15 will be fundamental to achieving this, as it proposes legislative changes that would complete the consumer-driven banking framework by transferring its governance to the Bank of Canada and making a legislative amendment to the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act that would grant Canadians a right to data mobility, supporting an economy-wide approach to data sharing.

All Canadians are expected to benefit from a consumer-driven banking framework. It would promote competition and reduce risks in the financial services industry by regulating financial data sharing. For consumers, this could mean greater financial inclusion, more informed decisions and better management and reduction of financial stressors. For businesses, it could mean improved access to new forms of financing and reducing the administrative burden with better integration and automation of key functions.

Lower income and financially stressed households are expected to benefit most through access to lower-cost products, clearer choices and tools to manage debts and reduce financial stress.

What is more is this is not only the way that Bill C-15 would help Canadian financial consumers save and manage their money. Competition in the sector can also drive efficiency and support economic development and productivity, as financial institutions are driven to allocate capital to their most productive uses.

Budget 2025 and Bill C-15 build on actions our new government has already taken to make life more affordable by delivering three major tax cuts, supercharging homebuilding to increase supply and lower housing costs and introducing automatic federal benefits so that millions of Canadians receive the support they qualify for.

That is why budget 2025 and Bill C-15 merit our full support.

• (1300)

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the hon. member across the way mentioned that the Liberals cancelled the carbon tax. I am wondering if he could explain where they got the idea to axe the tax.

Hon. Shafqat Ali: Mr. Speaker, we are looking to move forward. We are dealing with the crisis of our lifetime, and we are meeting the moment to address affordability issues.

The Prime Minister and this new government have a clear vision to eliminate divisiveness. The consumer carbon price was dividing Canadians, so we cut the consumer carbon price—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Rimouski—La Matapédia.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague just said that this government has a clear vision. Let us discuss its clear vision.

It is running a record \$78-billion deficit, based on \$45 billion in so-called investments in assets, a practice that has been criticized by the Parliamentary Budget Officer himself. I want my colleague to explain how he can talk about fiscal restraint when he is involved in running the biggest deficit in history and also changing the accounting rules in an attempt to muddy the waters.

Has his definition of fiscal restraint changed, or is it his definition of fiscal transparency that has changed?

• (1305)

[*English*]

Hon. Shafqat Ali: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised by my colleagues, who voted against our generational budget, which includes dental care and health care transfers to provinces. This is a budget to build, protect and empower. It will address affordability and build the strongest economy in the G7. This is a budget focused on spending less and investing more so we can build the strongest economy in the G7.

Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know one thing the President of the Treasury Board was involved with in the development of the budget was the comprehensive expenditure review, which found \$60 billion in savings over five years. I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board can give us an update on that process and how it will save Canadians money over the long term.

Hon. Shafqat Ali: Mr. Speaker, as members know, we are facing new norms and new realities. Things have changed globally, so we are focused on spending less and investing more and on finding savings to reassign resources where it matters most to Canadians. That is why we launched the comprehensive expenditure review, and we will be balancing our operational budget in the next three years.

Government Orders

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board said the government is “spending less to invest more”. The Prime Minister said the deficit would be capped at \$62 billion, but this budget has it at \$78 billion. Is 78 more or less than 62?

Hon. Shafqat Ali: Mr. Speaker, the new government was elected on the mandate to spend less and invest more and to build the strongest economy in the G7, and that is exactly what we are focused on. Budget 2025 is focused on delivering investments in our Canadian Armed Forces, in infrastructure and in housing, which means massive opportunities for jobs and the growth of our economy.

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there was some noise there. I do not believe the President of the Treasury Board heard the question. Is 78 more or less than 62?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): That is clearly a matter of debate, not a point of order.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Davenport.

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as always, it is such a pleasure for me to rise in the House on behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport to speak to budget 2025. This is an important budget delivered in extraordinary times.

Let us start off by being very honest about where we are. The world is more dangerous and divided, and Canada is very much facing a world that is rapidly changing and is increasingly uncertain. The rules-based international order and the trading system that powered Canada's prosperity for decades are being reshaped, which is hurting companies, displacing workers and causing major disruption and upheaval for Canadians.

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

Let me speak to one of the many items that matter to the people in my riding of Davenport.

The number one thing I hear about is jobs. People continue to be worried. Will they continue to have good-paying jobs? Will their kids coming out of school have opportunities? Without a good-paying job, no one will be able to afford a home or live a decent life.

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

Davenport has many union construction workers, and I want to give a shout-out to LIUNA Local 183, which is the largest union for construction workers. We are so blessed to have them in our city building our city and our country. They contribute so much to our national economy.

In budget 2025, we are providing \$75 million over three years to expand the union training and innovation program for apprenticeship training in the Red Seal trades. For workers who are impacted by tariffs, we have \$570 million over three years for training and employment assistance, plus new workforce alliances bringing together employers, unions and industry groups. Finally, we are also launching a youth climate corps, with \$40 million over two years to train young Canadians to respond to climate emergencies and strengthen community resilience.

Another big priority for Davenport is culture and the arts. Very blessedly, there are many artists in my constituency. While these times are tough and our government has had to make some hard choices, let me be very clear: Culture matters and the arts matter. During uncertain times, we stay united by sharing our stories. The arts help us interpret the world around us. The arts and culture sector contributed \$65 billion to our economy in 2024.

In budget 2025, we invest \$769 million over five years in arts and culture, which includes \$150 million for CBC/Radio-Canada, \$150 million for Telefilm Canada, \$127.5 million for the Canada Media Fund, and support for festivals and performing arts. We have also introduced an artist's resale right, allowing visual artists to receive royalties when their work is resold, something the sector, including many from my constituency of Davenport, have advocated for for years.

Public safety is the third top priority for Davenport. Residents are worried about auto theft, home invasions and gun crime. I want my constituents to know that this issue is among the highest priorities of our government.

The budget provides \$1.7 billion over four years to the RCMP to hire 1,000 new personnel to fight transnational organized crime, financial crimes and money laundering. We are also providing almost \$700 million over five years to the Canada Border Services Agency to hire up to 1,000 new officers, building on the \$1.3-billion border plan announced in December. These officers will also stop guns and drugs from coming into our country. All this investment is in addition to a number of strong pieces of legislation making their way through the House, which include Bill C-14, Bill C-12 and Bill C-9.

Government Orders

• (1310)

Budget 2025 also has an important focus on seniors. For seniors, elderly benefits will reach over \$83 billion in 2025-26, supporting 7.5 million Canadians. We are also launching a national anti-fraud strategy. In 2024 alone, Canadians lost \$643 million to fraud, nearly a 300% increase since 2020. We continue supporting the new horizons for seniors program, which is a lifeline for many seniors in my riding and seniors across the country. Finally, we are introducing a personal support workers tax credit, providing up to \$1,100 per year. This is to support the amazing people who take care of our loved ones, because as our loved ones get older, they need a lot more support.

As chair of the Canada NATO Parliamentary Association, I take our commitments to defence very seriously. Budget 2025 confirms we will reach the NATO 2% target this fiscal year and are on a pathway to meet the 5% defence investment pledge by 2035. This budget provides \$81.8 billion over five years to ensure the Canadian Armed Forces have the support and the tools they need. We are also providing \$2 billion in 2025-26 for additional military assistance to Ukraine. As our Prime Minister has said, there can be no prosperity without security. I would also add that we must continue to do all we can to ensure the war stops in Ukraine and to help bring a just and lasting peace to the country.

I know there are concerns about the deficit, but we are acting from a position of fiscal strength. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, and the second-lowest deficit-to-GDP ratio. The IMF has validated the approach outlined in our budget, stating that we are using our fiscal space to make generational investments, and that is good. No one likes seeing large deficits, and we are committed to balancing the operating budget by 2028-29.

We are dramatically reducing how much we are spending to run government. Through our comprehensive expenditure review, we are achieving \$60 billion in savings over five years, eliminating duplication and using made-in-Canada AI tools. We are spending less on day-to-day operations so we can invest far more in capital investments, in building Canada.

This budget will catalyze \$1 trillion in investment over five years from provinces, territories, municipalities, indigenous communities and the private sector. We are investing \$51 billion over 10 years through the build communities strong fund for local infrastructure: hospitals, universities, roads, bridges, water systems and transit. The first two phases of nation-building projects are expected to trigger \$150 billion in total capital investment. We are also diversifying our trade relationships, working to double our overseas exports within a decade and unlocking \$300 billion in new opportunities for Canadian workers and businesses.

Canada has to make itself attractive to the world. Luckily, we are an amazing country. We have the critical minerals, the natural resources, the people and the leadership to do so.

Let me conclude with this. When times are tough, we stand together as Canadians. We look after one another. We invest in ourselves. We do not retreat; we advance. As our finance minister said, "To weather the storm of uncertainty, we will not lower our sails. Quite the opposite, we will raise them to catch the winds of economic change, because we believe in Canada."

I believe in Canada. I believe in my riding of Davenport. I believe in the resilience, the diversity and the determination that make our community and our country great. This is a moment for bold action, a moment to build the future we want for ourselves and for generations to come. Canada has faced challenges before and we have always emerged stronger. Budget 2025 is our plan to do exactly that: building our economy, protecting our communities, empowering our people and ensuring Canada emerges as the strongest economy in the G7.

I am proud of this budget; I am proud to support it, and it is always an honour to represent the people of Davenport.

• (1315)

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, many Liberal speakers have spoken about something very radical for the business community, which we have not seen a plan for yet. It is their commitment to double exports from Canada in a 10-year period. In my estimation, the only way we are going to see that happen is if the Liberals approve another pipeline off the B.C. coast.

Would the member agree that a pipeline is necessary for working toward the government's goal of doubling exports abroad to meet the needs of Canada's economic ambitions?

Julie Dzerowicz: Mr. Speaker, where I agree with my hon. colleague in his question is that we do have to build our economy bigger and faster than ever before so we are not reliant on any one country. We have been too reliant for too long on one huge partner. It has been very beneficial for us for almost 100 years, but now we are taking urgent, immediate and big actions to reorientate our economy, not only to strengthen ourselves internally but also to make sure we are diversifying our trade with trusted partners internationally.

I do think it will take up to 10 years and that it will be a huge effort for us to do that, but I also think we have the people, the skills, the talent and the resources to do so.

• (1320)

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, something happened in the last Liberal budget.

I think the Liberals tried to mislead just about everyone by making a distinction between operating expenses and capital expenditures. Unfortunately, their ploy did not work, because almost no one in the media or the opposition believed it. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that it was nonsense.

It might have made sense to separate operating expenses from investments, if the investments had been actual investments. Everyone knows that what the Liberals are trying to do in this budget does not make sense.

Will my colleague across the way encourage her caucus members to return to actual rigorous accounting standards, so that people can trust what is tabled in Parliament?

[*English*]

Julie Dzerowicz: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the hon. member.

Canada's government is presenting a responsible economic plan that leverages our world-class industries, our skills and talented workers, our diverse trade partnerships and a strong domestic market where Canadians can be our own best customers. We also have a very clear mandate, which is to spend less so we can invest more.

I hosted a big town hall about the budget last week. My constituents definitely had a question around our \$78-billion deficit. I spoke to them about how we are separating our operating expenditures from capital investments and massively decreasing our operating expenditures over the next five years. They understood that, they believe in it and they think we are on the right path.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague brought up the issue of the debt that is being taken on in order to fulfill some of the nation-building projects and to grow out our diversification in ways never seen before, as well as to significantly increase our spending in defence. She identified some of the criticism of that, and we do hear it, yet at the same time, the IMF and other organizations such as credit agencies have identified Canada as being in a position to take on this debt right now.

Therefore I have come to the conclusion that if we have the capacity to do this now, if we are one of the best-positioned countries to do it, there could be no better time possible than right now to invest heavily, given everything that is going on in the world, in particular our relationship with the United States.

Julie Dzerowicz: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question, comment and statement were excellent, and I agree with him.

In Canada, we are very blessed despite the changes that are happening in the world today. Despite many of the challenges that Canada is facing, we are acting from a strong fiscal position, and budget 2025 is our plan to ensure that we are building our economy, lowering our costs and making smart investments that will grow our economy for the long term.

Government Orders

Indeed we do have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio. The IMF has recognized our plan and has said that it is a right approach. This is our chance to build a stronger, more resilient economy with smart generational investments.

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House to speak on behalf of my constituents in Chilliwack—Hope.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, who is approaching a very important anniversary. She is coming up very soon on nearly 25 years in the chamber. I congratulate her. She is one of my favourite members to hear speak, and I look forward to hearing her after my remarks are done.

The budget implementation act, which is what we are debating today, would implement a budget of broken promises and failures. The government has broken its own word that it gave to Canadians during an election just six months ago.

The Prime Minister said he would keep the deficit at \$62 billion. Well, the budget has it at \$78 billion, so he broke that promise in less than six months. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but he is raising it and causing inflation by failing to keep that promise.

The Prime Minister promised to spend less, but we see in the budget that he is spending \$90 billion more, which equals \$5,400 more in inflationary spending per household in the country. It is hard sometimes for Canadians to picture \$90 billion, but they understand \$5,400. Having that inflationary spending piled onto each household should worry all Canadians.

The Prime Minister promised more investment, but the budget reveals that investment is collapsing. Since the Prime Minister took office, there have been over 48,000 fewer jobs in Canada, and billions of dollars' worth of investment has fled the country.

That is a record of failure, and I have outlined just a number of the broken promises.

The Liberal government is a government of slogans and a government that likes to say that this budget is a generational budget, which is true if we are talking about the impact of the increased debt on future generations. The key thing here for Canadians is to understand that because of the government's profligate spending and its disregard for taxpayer dollars, the government will now spend more on interest payments to bankers and bondholders than it will pay for health care transfers in this country.

Government Orders

The interest is \$55 billion, and again that is a number that is hard for Canadians to grasp, because most of them will never have \$1 million let alone \$1 billion. It is \$55 billion given away, spent on interest charges and not on making life more affordable for Canadians or on making health care better.

My province is mismanaged by the government of British Columbia, the B.C. NDP. I will admit that part of the mismanagement is with the provincial government. There are routine closures of emergency wards across the province, and people cannot access emergency medicine for hundreds of kilometres because they do not have adequate doctors, nurses and facilities.

If we tell the people in my province of British Columbia that sending \$55 billion to bankers and bondholders is better than spending more on health care, they will laugh in our faces. They will not accept that this is a generational budget. They know that sending away the money that should be going to program spending, just frittering it away on bankers and bondholders, is an inappropriate use of funds. It will continue under the current Liberal government, which makes Justin Trudeau look like a fiscal hawk. It has doubled his deficit.

Right around this time last year, the Liberals did not know who was going to present the economic update, because the finance minister at the time had resigned because she could not in good faith present a budget that presented a deficit about 50% lower than the one just introduced in this budget. The whole government was thrown into turmoil and had to rip the page out of the economic update that had her name on it. It just tabled it in the House without even giving a speech, because she was so concerned that it limited the fiscal manoeuvrability of the government to be so irresponsible in the face of the economic changes we keep hearing about.

• (1325)

The Liberal government said one year ago that there needed to be fiscal responsibility. Fast-forward to today, and the money taps are open; it is an open bar. Here we are spending money again, \$55 billion in interest payments alone.

That is something that should concern all Canadians, as should the the figures on the national debt. As a continuation of the previous Liberal government, the Prime Minister will add \$321.7 billion to the federal debt over the next five years. That is more than twice the \$154.4 billion that Justin Trudeau would have added over the same time period.

The Liberals like to talk up the central banker's resume and what a genius he is financially, but he is doubling the burden being left to our kids and grandkids to pay back. They think it is such a master stroke to just spend more money. Why has no one thought of that before? Why do we not just spend more? Why not make it \$600 billion? Why not make the deficit \$150 billion? It is because they know it has to be paid back through taxes or program cuts, but they do not care.

The Liberals are just trying to get through today. They just want to get through the next four years. They do not care about 40 years down the road, when our children and grandchildren will pick up the tab. That is why we have called the budget a credit card budget. The Liberals are running up the credit card, and they are going to

hand the bill to our kids and grandkids, living large for today so someone else can pay the bill tomorrow. It is irresponsible. We would never allow it to happen in our own families.

I know you are a father, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine buying a Maserati and a huge mansion, living large, taking three or four holidays a year, and then saying to the kids when they reach working age, "Well, kids, Dad's had a good ride. You can pay the bill. Thanks for coming out"? Of course no responsible parent would do that, and no responsible government would look future generations in the eye and tell them they will have to pay tomorrow for what the government does today. That would be irresponsible, and it does not even deliver the results that government members say it does.

The Liberals talk about the Major Projects Office. They keep announcing the winners and losers of the major projects. Instead of creating an environment where all major projects can be approved if they meet the regulations, they say that certain projects do not meet the regulations but that they are going to allow them to go through anyway. They are going to give an exemption to certain projects.

Oh, and by the way, all the projects they are announcing had already been announced six or eight years ago. Many of them are already being built. The Liberals say, "Look at us. What a fantastic number of projects there are."

I do not even know what the minister's portfolio is, as it changes so often; I think it is trade relations with the U.S. right now. In 2018 he stood in the Maritimes and announced that construction would be under way at the Sisson mine. Then he went out again over the last couple of weeks to say, "By the way, the mine I announced in 2018 is on the major projects list. Aren't you proud of us? Look at it investing for future generations." That is a scam.

The government fails to understand that we do not need it to pick winners and losers but to create a winning environment for investment in the country, for everyone to make their investment choices and make those investments, instead of an environment in which investors are fleeing this country.

I want to talk briefly about more failures of the government. The Prime Minister said that he would have a deal with the United States by July. We are at the middle point of November with no deal, and the U.S. tariffs are twice as high. He said he would have a resolution with China, but there are still tariffs on our canola and on our seafood. There are new tariffs from India on our peas. For our softwood lumber producers, the tariffs have increased threefold, to 45% for softwood lumber producers in my province of British Columbia, with hundreds of layoffs and thousands more jobs hanging in the balance.

The government has failed to deliver for Canadians. It has broken its promises. We will not support the budget nor the budget implementation act.

Government Orders

• (1330)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk a little about hypocrisy.

When the Leader of the Conservative Party sat around the Conservative government caucus back in the day, they actually had a deficit that was larger, when inflation is factored in, than the deficit that is here today. That is the reality of the 2009 budget, when his leader sat around the government caucus table.

Oh, how things have changed now that the Conservatives are in opposition. The difference is that the Liberal government believes in Canadians and believes in investing in Canada's infrastructure and the people of Canada.

Can the member indicate why today's Conservative leader does not believe in supporting Canadians and does not believe in the need to expand trade opportunities throughout the world for our businesses?

Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, yes, after the world economic and financial crisis, there was a big deficit.

The Conservatives got the budget back to balance by 2015. That was our record. That took a lot of hard work, because we believed in the importance of leaving a balanced budget for future generations. We did not want to increase the debt for them to pay back.

I am glad the member asked me a question. The last time he asked me a question in this House, I believe he was asking me why I did not support a consumer carbon tax. That is what he was on about. He asked that question of this side about a thousand times. I am glad he broke that promise.

Maybe he could keep the promise to keep the budget deficit to \$62 billion, and what a big challenge that would be. The Liberals could not even do that; it is at \$78 billion. The member does not know what he is talking about.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his passionate speech.

I strongly agree with one thing in particular that he mentioned. What the government is doing with public money is irresponsible. It is creating record deficits. It is increasing the debt even further, a debt that will have to be paid off by future generations. What is happening is irresponsible. My colleague put it well.

One specific example comes to mind among many. Collectively, this budget allocates \$100 billion in tax credits to the oil and gas industry. That is \$100 billion in subsidies disguised as tax credits. Not a single Conservative has told me that I am right. Given how passionate my colleague was in his speech, I have a feeling that this time it will work.

Does he agree with me that the \$100 billion collectively being given to the oil and gas industry in the form of tax credits epitomizes how irresponsible the current government is being?

[*English*]

Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we do need to talk about the oil and gas sector and the benefits it brings to the Canadian economy, the hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in revenues and royalties that go to pay for such things as our health care system, our education systems and the transfer payments that go across this country.

We need to be talking up the oil and gas sector as a great benefit to Canada. We do it the best in the world. We have the best environmental regulations, the best workers and the best product. If we did a better job of creating a level playing field so that everyone knew the rules and everyone could make investments that were not held up by the government, we could have even more benefit for Canadian families. We could have more benefit, in terms of lower taxes and better services.

On this side of the House, we will always support our oil and gas sector in this country.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is truly amazing, in terms of how the member reflects. The Conservatives also campaigned on the carbon tax. All he has to do is just reflect on Erin O'Toole.

Having said that, I am wondering if the member could provide a clear answer as to why the Conservative Party of Canada does not support investing in Canadians, investing in Canada's infrastructure or promoting external trade beyond the U.S. borders. Why is the Conservative Party not on board with those objectives?

Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, of course, we support investment in the country.

That is why, under a Conservative government, investments were up hundreds of billions of dollars, unlike under the Liberal government, with hundreds of billions of dollars leaving the country in the last 10 years. Tens of billions of dollars have fled the country since the Prime Minister took office.

We will take no lessons from this member, who has been a member of a party that has been for a carbon tax and against it in a matter of weeks. We will certainly try to give him a lesson on being fiscally responsible. He has not learned it yet.

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the right-all-along people of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

I would like to begin by congratulating my Liberal colleagues on their resilience. To be able to eat such a huge slice of humble pie and not choke on their own hypocrisy is impressive.

Government Orders

Nearly half the omnibus budget bill is just repealing Trudeau-era policies. For my colleagues across the aisle to have to admit to being wrong about so much without showing a single sign of humility really speaks to the resilience of Liberal arrogance. They admit they were wrong about the consumer carbon tax, the boat tax, the digital services tax, the capital gains tax and more, yet they still swagger into this chamber with the absolute confidence that this time they are right and know what is best for Canada's economy.

Based on the 600-page budget implementation bill, what the Prime Minister thinks best are massive piles of corporate welfare. Here is one example, from page iii of the budget bill: "providing a refundable investment tax credit to qualifying corporations and trusts for investments in certain clean electricity property".

If any Canadians watching are wondering who the biggest investor in clean electricity is, I will give them a hint: It starts with "Brook" and ends with "field". Last year, the clean electricity tax credit cost the treasury \$22 million. This year, the tax credit will cost \$1.5 billion; next year, it will cost \$3.8 billion. By 2028, the government projects that it will cost \$7.2 billion. That is 328 times what it cost last year for just one tax credit that will mostly flow to one company: Brookfield.

There is more. The budget is giving the Canada Infrastructure Bank \$15 billion more. Maybe it is just a coincidence that the Clerk of the Privy Council was the former head of the Infrastructure Bank, but the Liberals are increasing its funding despite its failure to achieve its goal of using public money to attract private investment. We know the bank failed, because the government keeps telling us that it failed. Every Liberal budget has acknowledged the lack of private investment and the damage it is doing to our productivity.

The Infrastructure Bank failed so spectacularly that the Liberals created the Canada Growth Fund, with the identical mandate of using public money to attract private investment. In an act of corporate synergy that would make McKinsey & Company proud, the Brookfield government is leveraging the Canada Growth Fund to catalyze the clean electricity tax fund. In plain, human language, the Liberals are giving companies such as Brookfield cash handouts from the Growth Fund and then allowing the companies to get tax credits for spending the handouts. Companies such as Brookfield will get a shiny new asset to put on their balance sheet and a little spending money on the side. Canadians get a bigger tax bill and higher electricity prices.

I do not need a crystal ball to tell members that this is going to fail to increase economic productivity. It will not leverage, catalyze or spur any private investment; it will destroy private investment. If there were a real business case, it would not need subsidies. This means that any investment it attracts comes at the expense of real opportunities for growth. That is not just a fact; it is a basic physical reality. The Brookfield government can try to ignore reality, but eventually reality will hit it like a freight train.

Unfortunately for anyone who owns property between Quebec City and Toronto, the government plans to hit them with a high-speed train. Justin Trudeau launched the largest expropriation of private property in Canadian history with his gun grab. Now, even that legacy is not safe. Buried in the budget bill is the biggest land

grab in a century. Canadians might be shocked to learn that when the bill passes, the high-speed rail line from Quebec City to Toronto will be automatically approved.

The Liberals do not know where the rail line will be built, but it is already approved. If anyone's home is in the way, they will expropriate it. They just need to delete sections 8 through 12 of the Expropriation Act to get it done. In fact, they are so confident in pre-approving the rail line without knowing the actual route that the government is amending the Canada Transportation Act to remove the ability of the government to amend the approval.

• (1340)

I want to remind Canadians that half the bill is the government repealing decisions made by the Liberal government. Now the Liberals want to tie their hands to prevent any future government from correcting this mistake. There is a big difference between cutting red tape and throwing all the tape out the window. If any of this sounds out of character for the tape-happy Liberal Party, we should not worry; they return to form on the next page of the legislation.

Again, with the bill, the entire high-speed rail line would be approved automatically and without an actual route. Then the bill states that the entire rail line would be exempt from the dreaded unconstitutional Impact Assessment Act. However, each segment of the rail line would be subject to the Impact Assessment Act. We can see where this would go, because we have seen it all before. Once the Liberals determined the route, they would begin expropriating the land; then they would find a turtle or a frog on the land. The activists and proud socialists would demand that the Liberals adjust the segment of the line. If it is a Liberal riding, the line would move; if it is a Conservative riding, they would plow through. In the end, the government would have to take some other people's land and those whose land was needlessly expropriated would just have to watch from the sidelines.

For a while now, I have wondered how the government was going to hit the ridiculous target of restoring 30% of Canada's developed lands to nature by 2030. One way would be to cut a straight line through the most developed and expensive lands in Canada, claiming it is for high-speed rail, then killing the entire project by blaming some turtles that are trying to win the Darwin prize.

I said earlier that I do not need a crystal ball; that is because I have a history book. We have seen this all before. In 1972, Pierre Trudeau expropriated farmland in Pickering to build an airport. By 1975, the airport plan was on hold. The government kept the land and, in January of this year, announced that there would be no airport, but the lands would go to Parks Canada to be included in the Rouge National Urban Park. The current bill would make the Pickering land grab look like a picnic.

The budget would give the unnamed rail corporation the power to issue stop work orders on any land it thinks it may need for the rail line. Once the government puts someone's property on the "maybe" list, it would have the first right of refusal for any sale. The rail corporation would have the right to issue stop work orders on any activity on the land, and the corporation would have the right to go onto their property at any time to ensure the work has stopped. In a normal expropriation, people receive a notice of intent, and then they have the option to object and a public hearing is held. Now they would receive the notice and still be able to object, but there would be no hearing. The final decision would be made by the minister behind closed doors.

Some Canadians listening to all this will think it has the makings of a second Pacific railway scandal. That would be delicious irony to fall on the party that gleefully tossed Sir John A. Macdonald down the memory hole, but erasing history has its consequences. If one of those consequences is the Liberals' sleepwalking into another sponsorship-sized scandal, then I am sure Sir John A. is smiling down on us. While I would relish the Liberals' paying a steep price for their arrogance, we also know from history what would happen: They would just walk off into the sunset of a corner office in a fancy law firm or a boardroom. It would be Canadians forced to pay the higher taxes to the bondholders. It would be Canadians forced off their lands during a housing crisis. It would be Canadians who lose the farm their family owned for generations.

When Liberals promise us a generational change, we should hide our wallets and lock our doors. The budget would cut benefits to veterans and students. It would lay off frontline workers. There would be all that plus billions of dollars in new debt for the biggest corporate welfare spending spree in history.

The Mackenzie King government ran up deficits to fight the Nazis. The Harper government ran up deficits to fight the global financial crisis. The Trudeau government ran up deficits to fight a global pandemic. The Brookfield government is running up deficits to reward its wealthy backers. Canadians cannot afford this takeover of their democracy. We need an affordable Conservative government now.

• (1345)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is apparently very clear: The Conservative Party and the Leader of the Conservative Party truly do not understand what it means to invest in Canada and invest in Canadians.

The Conservatives want to get rid of the Canada Infrastructure Bank. They call it a failure. They would get rid of it. They have no concept. Did they know the Infrastructure Bank is responsible for literally tens of thousands of jobs? When we take a look at the

Government Orders

projects that it has invested in, we see that there is an almost two-to-one return ratio. We are talking about billions and billions of dollars, yet the Conservatives stand back and say it does not exist and they are not aware of any projects.

They can do a simple Google search and look on the Internet. Investing in Canada is something the Infrastructure Bank has done, just like the budget. I am wondering if the member opposite would recognize that the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, the government does not know the difference between an investment and a purchase. It thinks buying a Lada is an investment.

If we add up all the money the Liberals have spent since they became a government in 2015, when there was an actual surplus, it is \$500 billion, with our national debt at \$1.266 trillion. Each household owes \$77,256. For any household that does not have the taxes to pay that back, this will be passed on to their children, including the students and children who are in the galleries today. They will be paying the debt we are talking about today.

• (1350)

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague on her speech.

I agree with some of the things she said. One is that the Liberal government changed the accounting rules. This criticism was echoed by the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The Liberals are trying to hide a deficit with artificial assets of \$45 billion out of \$78 billion. That is basically tantamount to trying to deceive people, at least those who have a basic understanding of accounting and finance.

That said, I have a question for my colleague. I do not understand the Conservatives' position. They told us that they would not support the budget if the deficit exceeded \$42 billion. I do not hear them criticizing the government's policies. Based on what I see, this is a Conservative budget. There are cuts to government spending, cuts to the public service and 15,000 people are at risk of being laid off. There is unprecedented spending in the military sector. There are tax credits for oil and gas companies to the tune of \$100 billion until 2040.

Give me a break. This is such a Conservative budget that Conservatives are crossing the floor to join the Liberals. I would like my colleague to specifically tell me what she does not like about the budget policies, apart from the deficit.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that there are 600 pages of things I do not like in the budget implementation bill, but he was correct about something in the preamble of his question. He talked about accounting practices. What the Liberals have done is a perversion of quantitative easing. They are simply taking expenses and putting them in the asset column. That is cheating, and any other government would be taken to task on it and thrown out of office.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question regarding the planned savings the government is projecting. It says it will save \$48 billion over the next five years. Most analysts are suggesting this is wishful thinking.

Over the past 10 years, the government has tried finding efficiencies and failed miserably. It has caused an affordability crisis never seen before.

Should Canadian voters believe the government's rosy projections this time around?

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I do not think Canadians believe them. I know of older people who cannot pay their rent or electricity bills now. They are telling me that if this bill goes through, they are going to sign up for MAID because they are already depressed and do not want to continue living this way. They would rather die than suffer the way the Liberal government has been making them suffer.

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Spadina—Harbourfront.

Today I rise to talk about my strong support for Bill C-15, the budget implementation act, and to highlight what this legislation means to the hard-working tradespeople who keep Canada moving forward every single day.

The trades are not just jobs; they are the backbone of our economy, the foundation of our infrastructure and the heart of our communities. In a country as large and diverse as Canada, skilled trades workers are essential in every region, from our busiest cities to our most rural coastal towns. That is even more evident in my own riding of South Shore—St. Margarets.

It is our tradespeople who keep our fisheries running, maintain our homes and our public buildings, and build the wharves, the roads, and the bridges that connect us. They support the marine, forestry and housing sectors that anchor our rural economies. From the traditional boatbuilders in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, to the electricians and carpenters in Bridgewater to the welders and machinists in Liverpool, these workers are essential to our way of life, to everyone's way of life. They are the people residents call when a storm damages a roof, when a community hall needs repairs, when a family business needs an addition or when a vessel must be brought back to life after decades at sea.

As a member of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, I hear directly from workers, unions, business owners and educators. We hear regularly about the challenges tradespeople face: the cost of living, affordable housing, the cost of modernizing

equipment and the importance of practical, hands-on training opportunities to keep pace with new technologies.

Bill C-15 as a whole responds to those concerns, not with slogans but with real, tangible, practical measures that will make a meaningful difference for workers and small businesses from coast to coast to coast. Today, I want to highlight five of the most significant measures in this budget and how it supports trades workers and strengthens the industries they power.

The first measure in the budget is the productivity superdeduction. This measure would allow businesses to immediately write off 100% of eligible capital investments. This means that small and medium-sized businesses, especially the shops that form the backbone of our communities, can upgrade their equipment right away without waiting years for depreciation to keep up.

The second measure is the clean electricity investment tax credit. This 15% refundable tax credit would help businesses invest in renewable energy and energy-efficient upgrades. In communities like mine, where the economy is closely tied to the ocean, clean energy investments are not just good for the environment, but reduce operating costs and create new opportunities for trades.

Imagine vessel sheds and processing plants with solar panels. Imagine a small business with a battery storage system that can protect against outages during storms. Imagine community buildings, marinas, workshops and boatyards completing energy-efficient retrofits that cut costs while putting local electricians, installers and energy professionals at work.

The third thing I would like to talk about, and why I am supporting this budget, is the investments in infrastructure and climate resilience. Budget 2025 would accelerate the permitting of major infrastructure projects, something rural and coastal communities are desperately in need of. Faster permitting means less time waiting for more building. Who does not like that? Oh wait, maybe it is those across the aisle. There would be more work for concrete crews, heavy equipment operators, carpenters and marine construction teams. Who does not like that?

This past summer, the town of Mahone Bay became a national model in my riding when it received federal support to build a living shoreline that protects homes, businesses and public spaces from storm surges and erosion. This shows what is possible when different levels of government work together and when trades workers are empowered to bring climate-resilient designs to life.

ROYAL ASSENT

• (1355)

[English]

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall
Ottawa

November 20, 2025

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that Mr. Ken MacKillop, Deputy of the Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bills listed in the Schedule to this letter on the 20th day of November, 2025, at 10:29 a.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ryan McAdam
Executive Director
Office of the Secretary to the Governor General

The schedule indicates the bills assented to were Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (2025)—Chapter 5, and Bill S-1001, An Act to authorize Gore Mutual Insurance Company to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of the Province of Quebec.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians sent us here to tackle the pressing issues they are facing and improve their lives. They want us to strengthen Canada and create a brighter future for our children.

New Democrats are inspired by Jack Layton, who urged us to make Parliament work and to deliver results for people. That is because we believe Canadians deserve a future where everyone can thrive, not just the privileged few. We are ready to roll up our sleeves and work to make that vision a reality.

It is clear that millions of Canadians are struggling right now. Instead of offering solutions, the Liberals are demanding sacrifices from workers while handing out billions to the wealthiest individuals and the most profitable corporations. They are slashing services and cutting thousands of family-sustaining jobs amid a jobs crisis.

New Democrats are ready to offer a different approach, with positive, constructive policies to build a stronger country and a fairer society.

* * *

ACT OF BRAVERY

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible bravery of a young constituent, Ms. Elaina Shay of Lunenburg County.

Statements by Members

On August 22, as hurricane Erin passed by Nova Scotia, Elaina and her mother were visiting Hirtle's Beach to watch the waves. What began as a calm afternoon quickly turned into sudden surges, which swept a woman off of her feet and pulled her into deep, powerful water. Without hesitation, Elaina leapt from her chair, ran into the waves and lifted the woman to her feet, guiding her safely back to shore against the force of the current. Thanks to her quick thinking, courage and selflessness, a life was saved that day.

Elaina's mother, Jane Veinot-Taker, later reached out to our office to request a certificate of life-saving award in recognition of her daughter's heroic actions.

Elaina Shay is an inspiring example of courage and compassion in our community. We are proud to recognize her bravery here today.

* * *

CHARITABLE GIVING IN BOW RIVER

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we enter the Christmas season and celebrate the birth of Christ, Canadians are reminded that this is a time not only of celebration and hope, but also of compassion and grace.

Across our communities, local food banks and charities are working tirelessly to ensure that no family goes hungry and that every child feels the joy of Christmas. Their work reflects the best of who we are, which is to be generous, caring and grounded in faith and service. Across my riding in Bow River, charities are ensuring that families and children have the support they need this season. The Wheatland County Food Bank holiday food drive is helping local families in Strathmore, while St. Joseph's Parish in Vauxhall is once again setting up its angel tree to collect gifts for the Vauxhall and Area Food Bank.

Matthew reminds us, "whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me."

Let us support these efforts. Let us also ensure that government policy respects and empowers faith-based charities and parishes whose missions lift up the most vulnerable in our communities.

*Statements by Members***ORGANIC FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN**

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recently met with Riverside Natural Foods, a proud constituent company headquartered in my riding and a leader in Canada's organic food supply chain. Known for its MadeGood brand, Riverside exemplifies the innovation and collaboration that connects farmers, processors, consumers and the power of organics to link people to the food we eat and the planet we share. Riverside is growing by 30% to 40% annually and uses 95% organic ingredients, which are ideally Canadian grown.

A new national report confirms that organic production boosts farm profitability, lowers greenhouse gas emissions and sustains soil health and biodiversity, yet the United States spends eight times more per acre on organics than Canada.

I encourage all members to support the Canadian Organic Alliance and its organic action plan, which is a national policy framework to modernize regulations and grow markets.

* * *

● (1405)

HOLODOMOR

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the fourth Saturday of every November, Canadians join Ukrainians around the world to remember the Soviet-forced famine and genocide of 1932-33 called the Holodomor.

Joseph Stalin's Communist regime deliberately killed millions of people in Ukraine for being Ukrainian. Stalin wanted to exterminate their language, culture, religion and identity. After he eliminated the clergy, political leaders, academics and farmers, he then weaponized food. To grasp the scale of this genocide in Ukraine, we can imagine stripping bare every grocery store, home, farm, fridge and cupboard across western Canada today and then watching every man, woman and child slowly starve to death. That is the horror millions of Ukrainians endured.

Stalin and his Soviet thugs failed to Russify Ukraine then, and Vladimir Putin and his Russian barbarians will fail in his Russification of Ukraine today. This week, as we remember the victims of the Holodomor, we stand with those fighting for Ukraine's very survival.

May their memories be eternal. *Vichnaya pamyat.*

* * *

[Translation]

COURRIER LAVAL

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the 80th anniversary of Courrier Laval, a fixture in local news and a key part of Laval's community life. For eight decades, this newspaper has upheld journalistic standards, remained close to its audience, and maintained its commitment to them, keeping them informed and bringing them together.

From the very first edition written by its founder, José Limoges, to the most recent edition, led by Martin Olivier and Patrick Marsan, Courrier Laval has changed with the times while remaining true to its mission: to reflect the reality of Laval and to high-

light its successes, its challenges and the people who shape its identity.

At a time when information travels at such high speeds, local media remains key to preserving our culture and our democracy and bringing people together.

I congratulate the entire team on 80 years of service, dedication and passion.

* * *

[English]

KEITH THOM

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Keith Thom lived his life with purpose. He left a lasting legacy in Peachland and for all of us who knew him. Known to many as Papa Thom, he could light up a room, whether it was through music or a smile.

As a dedicated municipal councillor and deputy mayor, Keith embodied kindness and service. He raised thousands for food banks during the pandemic and honoured our veterans, including his father, on his last visit to Holland. This pride showed in small gestures. At our last breakfast, he shared stories of retracing his father's steps in the liberation of the Netherlands, and he gave me this tie, the official tartan of British Columbia. I wear it today in his honour. These small acts of kindness were part and parcel to Keith.

My condolences go to his wife, Mary Lynn, his children, Fiona, Andrew and Rachael, as well as Charles, Alexander and Mathew, and their families.

I join the Peachland mayor and council in grieving. The district has suggested donations to the Peachland Food Bank, a cause Keith championed. Keith believed in giving back and lifting others up. Let us honour his legacy by doing the same.

Rest in peace, Papa Thom.

* * *

WORLD FISHERIES DAY

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on November 21, we mark World Fisheries Day, and recognize the vital role sustainable fisheries and healthy oceans play in our local economies and in our shared future. Coastal communities across our country rely on the ocean for their livelihoods. For generations, it has defined our culture and our identity.

Canada is known around the globe for our world-class seafood and our healthy oceans. Budget 2025 strengthens Canada's capacity to safeguard our coastlines and grow our fisheries through supporting small craft harbours and strong measures to grow our economy and expand our markets. These investments will build a more resilient industry, healthier oceans and stronger fishing communities. On this World Fisheries Day, let us recognize how important they are to all Canadians.

* * *

● (1410)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, crime is escalating, and families and workers in my community are paying the price.

In Cambridge, families sleeping in their beds and workers in retail and service jobs are now facing violent criminals. Just this week, there was a smash-and-grab at a Canadian Tire, an armed jewellery store robbery at the Cambridge Centre and gunshots fired at a family home. Imagine being a retail worker wondering if today is the day mass criminals will storm in with weapons. Innocent employees are looking to earn a paycheque and feed their families, but now, nowhere feels safe, not even at home or at work.

My community is done waiting. They are speaking up loudly. They are flooding my email. They expect the government to protect them, not be easy on criminals who terrorize their streets. What they get from the Liberal government is half measures and a weak justice system where criminals roam free.

Cambridge has a message for the government. It has had enough of the soft-on-crime approaches that put criminals ahead of Canadians. Cambridge residents are asking the government to stop the revolving door of crime and bring back consequences to protect our community.

* * *

[Translation]

JEAN-PAUL DIAMOND

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Mauricie region recently lost one of its pioneers.

Jean-Paul Diamond dedicated many years of his life to his community and region. Not only was he committed to social causes like the Association des personnes handicapées du comté de Maskinongé, the Festival de la truite mouchetée de Saint-Alexis-des-Monts and the Festival des neiges, Mr. Diamond was also a prominent figure in the political world.

Mr. Diamond was first a councillor and then mayor of the municipality of Saint-Alexis-des-Monts. He also served as reeve of the RCM of Maskinongé for roughly 10 years. He then had the privilege of representing his region in the Quebec National Assembly. Politics aside, we must recognize the sincere commitment and dedication of Mr. Diamond, who always worked towards developing his region and ensuring the well-being of his constituents.

I extend my deepest condolences to his loved ones, as well as to the entire community, which has lost a leader today.

Statements by Members

Mr. Diamond, we are grateful and we will remember you.

* * *

THE GRENADIERS

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1803, during the Battle of Vertières, a people rose up, overthrew colonial rule, and affirmed racial and gender equality. On that day, Haiti wrote an important page in the universal history of freedom and human dignity.

Fast forward to November 18, 2025, the Grenadiers, Haiti's national soccer team, qualified for the 2026 World Cup, which is being held here in Canada. This hard-working, proud, and resilient people have given us another victory, another reason to celebrate. Haiti's qualification paves the way for remarkable moments, not only for sport, but also for memory, hope, and the entire Haitian diaspora.

Sincere congratulations to Monique André of the Haitian Football Federation, as well as to the entire Grenadiers team, both coaches and players, for this invaluable gift to the Haitian people.

Toup pou yo.

* * *

[English]

COST OF FOOD

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Food prices are rising 40% faster here than in the United States, crushing workers, families, seniors and young people.

Today, Simcoe Hall Settlement House in Oshawa shared heart-breaking news. Families who have never needed help before are now walking into the food bank. Even long-time donors cannot give anymore because they are now struggling just to get by. One mother said her kids sometimes miss school because she cannot afford to pack a lunch.

Instead of giving parents real relief so they can afford to feed their own families, the Liberals point to a national school food program that does nothing to fix the affordability crisis at its root. Even while families struggle, Liberals hiked the industrial carbon tax, making food, farming and groceries even more expensive.

How many more families will be forced to line up at food banks before the government finally admits to the dire reality Canadians are facing?

*Statements by Members***NATIONAL CHILD DAY**

Hon. Karina Gould (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada should be the best place world to be a child and to raise a child.

On National Child Day, I reflect on the many steps we have taken to make this a reality. We introduced, in the last decade, the Canada child benefit, which has lifted half a million kids out of poverty. We created a national child care program, which is setting our kids up for success and enabling parents to stay in the workforce. We also created a national school food program that is feeding 400,000 kids in Canada.

While these are good and necessary steps, there is still so much more we can and must do to provide the best start in life for Canadian children. One such area we need to tackle is the increasing harms our children are facing online, including cyberbullying, exploitation, grooming and AI-generated abuse. Children's organizations, parents and kids themselves are sounding the alarm.

Today, let us commit to tackling these new and emerging issues because all of our nation's kids deserve to live in safety and with every opportunity to build a bright future.

* * *

● (1415)

TAXATION

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal government, Canadians cannot afford another Prime Minister who cashes in while they line up at food banks.

As Brookfield Chair, the Prime Minister helped funnel \$6.5 billion through Bermuda and Cayman tax havens, dodging Canadian taxes for his personal benefit. That is not public service; it is self-service. Every dollar hidden offshore is a dollar not building homes, funding health care or supporting veterans and seniors who did everything right and are now falling behind.

Canadians see the pattern. The Prime Minister doubled Trudeau's deficits, cooked up the second-most expensive budget in history, fudged the numbers to hide how bad it was, and now, we learn that he helped the biggest tax dodger in Canada shelter billions. While the Prime Minister and his Bay Street buddies hide money at a Bermuda bike shop, he tells young Canadians to tighten their belts. This is unacceptable.

Conservatives demand an end to this insider game. We will close the loopholes and put Canadians first by cutting taxes for real growth and hope.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in eastern Prince Edward Island fishing is not just an industry; it is a way of life and part of our identity.

More than 1,200 licensed harvesters contribute over \$300 million annually to the island economy, with lobster alone accounting for nearly 70% of our landed value. Over the past several months, I have had the opportunity to meet with fishers and the industry stakeholders in the region. These conversations focus on what mat-

ters most to our fishing communities: fair prices, deterrence of illegal fishing activity, sustainable stock management, safe working conditions and ensuring the next generation can continue this proud tradition in Atlantic Canada.

As we lead up to World Fisheries Day on November 21, let us reaffirm our gratitude to the harvesters, plant workers, buyers, families and coastal communities, whose dedication sustains one of Canada's most vital industries. Their knowledge, experience and commitment to sustainable harvesting ensures that our coastal communities remain strong for generations to come.

* * *

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister spends more time in the air than he does here in Canada, jet-setting with global elites. In just eight months, he has taken 28 trips, racking up over 153,000 kilometres, which is enough to circle the globe nearly four times. What does he have to show for these air miles? He has absolutely nothing: no trade deals and no results.

Every time he is wheels up, Canadians get higher costs and higher tariffs. When he met the Americans, U.S. tariffs doubled. India has slapped tariffs on our peas. China is hammering our farmers on canola. Auto workers are losing their jobs.

Now the Prime Minister is on another trip. He is in Dubai just a few days after Brookfield invested billions of dollars there. What a coincidence. He is always there for his Brookfield friends, but he is never there for hard-working Canadians. He has plenty of takeoffs, but no takeaways for Canadians, because he has a net-zero record when it comes to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for London Centre.

* * *

PANCREATIC CANCER

Peter Fragiskatos (London Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, November 20, is World Pancreatic Cancer Day. Every year, 7,000 Canadians are diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, and more than 6,000 succumb to this terrible disease.

One was my late aunt, Eleni Dellaporta, who passed away this past January at the young age of 58. She leaves behind two extraordinary sons, Nikos and Panagis; her beloved husband, Petros; and her soon-to-be daughters-in-law, Bernice and Koralia.

All of this brings to mind the continued importance of research, awareness and making sure that early detection becomes possible. When we focus on those things, it does become possible.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's deal with Canadians was to elect him and he would get us a win on tariffs. Since then, he has taken over 20 trips, which might be worth it if he came home with better deals, but he is not.

After meeting with the U.S., tariffs are even higher than before. After meeting with China, we now have new tariffs on grain and seafood. India put new tariffs on peas after their meeting. He claimed to have some kind of special ability that would result in new trade deals, but it turns out he is not that special; he is just another Liberal.

Will the Prime Minister admit he is failing on trade, or is making things worse part of some genius strategy?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today our government took another step forward in our commitment to double non-U.S. trade over the next decade and diversify our economy. While in the U.A.E., the Prime Minister signed a foreign investment promotion and protection agreement to create a more predictable environment for two-way investments. We also launched negotiations for a Canada-U.A.E. comprehensive economic partnership trade deal. This agreement would cut tariffs, remove trade barriers and expand market access for Canadian exporters.

With a signed FIPA and the launch of CEPA, we are opening doors, creating new markets and creating opportunities for Canadian workers and businesses.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is typically Liberal: Things are always just about to start getting better. Meanwhile, actual tariffs keep going up.

One way to increase trade with other countries would be with a pipeline to British Columbia's west coast, but the Liberals killed northern gateway in 2016, resulting in billions in lost opportunities for Canadian workers and businesses. Now there is talk of reviving that pipeline, but of course, if the shipping ban stays in place, no one will be able to export what comes through the pipe.

Oral Questions

The Liberals made it illegal to ship Canadian energy off Canada's west coast. Does that law also ban U.S. tankers from travelling through the same area?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a tremendous opportunity to be a leading energy superpower. This government was elected to deliver nation-building projects, strengthen our economy, reinforce Canadian autonomy and advance indigenous prosperity while contributing to clean growth. We are working with all provinces, including Alberta, to achieve these shared objectives.

The federal government has been engaged in constructive talks with the Government of Alberta, and we will have more to say in a few weeks.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, after 10 years, we are just on the cusp of things all coming together, but I can answer the question the minister did not answer himself. The answer is no.

While the Liberals have made it illegal for Canadian companies to load Canadian ships with Canadian oil, U.S. tankers can continue to travel off B.C.'s coast and take their oil to countries around the world. As we speak, the U.S. crude oil tanker *California* is travelling from Tacoma to Alaska along the west coast.

Why are the Liberals keeping in a law that prevents Canada from exporting our oil while U.S. tankers travel through the exact same place?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member across the aisle is not happy, but the Premier of Alberta has said that she is quite supportive of what we are doing and is looking forward to finishing conversations with the Prime Minister.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since taking office, the Prime Minister has made more than 20 trips abroad under the pretext of wanting to create a richer Canada. However, the results have been the complete opposite. During the Prime Minister's travels around the world, Donald Trump's tariffs have doubled. Tariffs on aluminum are now sitting at 50%, lumber tariffs have tripled and thousands of Canadian jobs have been lost. With every trip he takes, new tariffs are imposed on Canadians.

Can the Prime Minister put away his passport, stay in Canada and take care of his country?

Oral Questions

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs, Internal Trade, and One Canadian Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague knows very well that the government was elected with a mandate to diversify our trade with other countries around the world. This is an ambitious agenda that Canadians supported in the last election. Perhaps my colleague was a bit confused. Generally, that starts with the head of government taking a trip, to the United Arab Emirates for example. The good news is that we have signed an agreement with this important investor country.

We will continue to support the Canadian economy.

* * *

• (1425)

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they were elected under false pretenses. They were supposed to find a solution to the problems with Donald Trump, but they have failed miserably.

Meanwhile, the country has other major problems, including problems at the Canada Revenue Agency. The cost of government bureaucracy has risen by 80% since the Liberals took office, and now, nearly one million people cannot even access the Canada Revenue Agency's website. Some agents are providing incorrect information and some people are erroneously being told that they owe money. It is a total mess.

The minister said that he would fix all that. Where do things stand now?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleague, as was announced by the Minister of Finance and National Revenue in the fall, that we have a 100-day plan to ensure that Canadians receive fast, accurate and reliable services from the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA.

Since the plan was implemented, the CRA's call centre capacity has doubled, and 70% of callers now receive a response in less than 15 minutes. Canadians also no longer need to call the CRA to get access to their files online. That is good news.

The finance minister's plan is working.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, former minister Diane Lebouthillier spent a decade making cuts. She cut CRA services. Cuts are still happening. People come to our constituency offices every day to complain about problems. Women cry in our staffers' arms. I myself have had a hard time using the services. It took me four attempts to resolve a tax issue I had. There is a problem. Nothing has been fixed.

Can the government treat this like an emergency and fix the problem? This is urgent.

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing. We recognize that Canadians deserve fast, accurate and reliable service from the CRA. The Minister of

Finance's plan is working. Seventy per cent of Canadians now get an answer in less than 15 minutes. People no longer need to call the CRA to access its online services. We have also doubled the capacity of CRA call centres.

* * *

CLIMATE CHANGE

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had two choices this week. He could go to Brazil, to COP30, to show that he has not completely capitulated in the fight against climate change, or he could go to the Middle East to make deals with oil monarchies. He chose the oil monarchies, just as he put oil companies first in the budget by offering them billions of dollars in tax credits and exempting them from a cap on their greenhouse gas emissions. It is hard to imagine that before getting into politics, he was a champion of green finance.

Does he realize that by betraying his values, he is also betraying the former director of Équiterre, who is sitting to his right?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did indeed have a choice to make this week. He chose to be here in the House twice to vote for a historic budget for Quebecers and Canadians.

This Prime Minister will always act in the best interests of Canada, will always act in favour of opportunities and will always act to build and improve the possibilities and opportunities available to Quebecers.

The Bloc Québécois should do the same.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister was ignoring COP to meet with sultans in Abu Dhabi, Canada was receiving a barrage of criticism. Two thousand organizations from around the world gave Canada the fossil of the day award for backtracking in the fight against climate change.

Canada is a world champion of pollution. Oddly enough, the last time Canada received the fossil award was in 2014. The Canadian prime minister at the time, Stephen Harper, also ignored COP.

Is that a coincidence or are the Liberals setting us back 10 years?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the United Arab Emirates is one of the world's largest investors in renewable energy.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is in good company having brushed off the COP summit to meet with oil monarchies, because Canada is an oil monarchy. That is its identity. It received a fossil award at COP, just like the oil monarchies. It ranks 61 out of 67 countries in the climate performance index, alongside the oil monarchies.

Today, the Liberals want to take another step backward. They want to reach an agreement with Alberta to build a new dirty oil pipeline. That is the Canadian identity. The Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture did not defend this before. How can he defend it now?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I went to COP. I had meetings with countries and environmental organizations. They told us that Canada has an important role to play in the fight against climate change, that Canada can be a unifying force for all countries.

Not only that, but when we build our country strong, we work with other countries that want our cleaner energy.

We have clean energy to sell, and we are ready to make those commitments.

* * *

● (1430)

[*English*]

FINANCE

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2006, the Harper government saw the need for an independent parliamentary fiscal watchdog, and boy was it right. In his budget brief last week, the PBO reminded the Prime Minister of the Liberals' own words just last November that reducing the federal debt-to-GDP ratio over the medium term is "key not only for fiscal sustainability, but also to preserve Canada's AAA credit rating". Well, it is less than a year later and the alarm bells are ringing.

How many more times does the Prime Minister need to be reminded to rein in his spending of taxpayers' dollars?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier today in the chamber, the member for Calgary Midnapore said that the Prime Minister's loyalty was not to Canada or to Canadians. That is a direct quote. I would invite her to retract that statement at this very time.

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly credit card budget loads reckless spending today on tomorrow's taxpayers, something an economist should know. After—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Calgary Midnapore may continue.

Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's loyalties are to Brookfield.

The Prime Minister's costly credit card budget loads reckless spending today onto tomorrow's taxpayers, something an economist should know. After 10 years of the Liberals, Canadians are being forced to put nearly 50% more of their personal expenses on credit cards, a result of Liberal financial failures. Fitch Ratings has warned that because the Liberals are ignoring their own fiscal—

The Speaker: The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speak-

Oral Questions

er, I do not think debate in the chamber is served by challenging a Prime Minister who has stood up for public service in Canada, challenging his patriotism or his service to his country. I know that member does not believe those things. I would invite her to restrain her comments with respect to the Prime Minister's feelings about the country and about the people that he serves.

I would once again invite her to retract those comments.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of reckless spending by the Liberals, Canadians have been forced to put 50% more of their expenses on credit cards since 2015. It is so bad that the budget watchdog has condemned the Liberal spending, saying it is "unsustainable" and "shocking".

When will the Prime Minister finally put an end to his out-of-control spending spree so that Canadians can put food on their table?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on one side of the House, we have continued tired old rhetoric, the same questions that question a Prime Minister with world-class business and economic experience, versus a leader from the Conservatives who has been in the House for 20 years and has not had a job outside the House.

On this side of the House, we are focused on building a strong economy. We are focused on making historic investments in infrastructure, defence, housing and transportation. On this side, we are serious about the economy. They continue with the same old, tired rhetoric.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister should be tired of having a reckless record when it comes to the CRA. He should fix the CRA before he fixes anything else. The agency that gives the government its credit score says that since the Liberal government frequently ignores its fiscal anchors, the federal finances face a high risk of further deterioration.

I have a simple question for the Prime Minister: When will he take his job seriously and get Canada's finances back on track so that Canadians can afford a life?

● (1435)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 28, Canadians had a choice to make between two visions for the country. One was a vision of slogans and divisiveness. On this side, our Prime Minister, with world-class business and economic experience, had a plan to build our country, to invest in our country and to build a country by Canadians and for Canadians.

Oral Questions

On this side of the House, we are serious about building a stronger Canada, a Canada for everyone. That side is not.

* * *

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a Prime Minister who describes himself as a European is giving \$500 million to the European Space Agency to create good jobs in Europe. It gets worse. The Harwell Science and Innovation Campus, where the European Space Agency is located in the U.K., is 50% owned by Brookfield.

Rather than focusing on lining the pockets of Brookfield and ripping off Canadian workers, why do they not invest in Canada?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the other side does not recognize the key role that space investments play in our country and in our nation's innovations, especially in a critical year for space for Canada, when we are sending not one, but two astronauts into space.

This is an incredibly exciting time for Canada and Canadians to be inspired by the potential of space and space in our economy. I hope the other side reconsiders their opposition to this.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an incredibly exciting time if a person is a shareholder in Brookfield right now, let me say that, with all the slimy contracts that these guys are giving to companies affiliated with Brookfield. Meanwhile, we have 2.2 million Canadians lining up at food banks; we have a 6.9% unemployment rate. What did the government decide to do? They are investing \$500 million to give jobs to Europe.

How can it be a priority of the government to give jobs to Europeans when there is 6.9% unemployment in Canada and 2.2 million people using a food bank? Justify that.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the most innovative things we can do as a country, we often do them together and with other countries. For instance, a former member of this House, a former minister in the former government, the late Hon. Marc Garneau, went on an American spacecraft. There is a key piece of Canadian technology that was deployed as part of that, the Canadarm. It is a piece of technology we should all be proud of, on both sides of this House.

As we continue to co-operate with our European partners on this, let us see the bigger picture and see how benefits can come to Canada with this investment.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the past 10 years since the Liberals came to power, the bureaucracy has grown by 80%. Unfortunately, the quality of public services has not kept pace. Today, the TVA program *J.E.* reported that 950,000 calls were made to the Canada Revenue Agen-

cy because Canadians could not access its online services. That is the reality after 10 years of Liberal governance.

This is true in my riding, and I am sure that it is true in the constituency offices of every member in the House. Every week, there are dozens of calls from constituents who are having problems with the CRA. That is the reality after 10 years.

Why have the Liberals let public services crumble?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the situation at the Canada Revenue Agency was unacceptable. Our government is acting quickly to provide Canadians with fast, efficient and reliable service. The plan is working. They can yell all they want, but the plan is working.

We have doubled the capacity of call centres. Now, 70% of Canadians get an answer within 15 minutes, and all Canadians can access online services without having to call the CRA. That is good news. The plan is working.

* * *

CANADIAN IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture is showing a complete disregard for Quebec's private broadcasters and their workers. Québecor has shed 800 jobs, but the minister is standing idly by. Cogeco Media and Bell Media have asked for help, but the minister is not lifting a finger. He is as indifferent to the media crisis as the Prime Minister is to the climate crisis.

Does the minister realize that his indifference and his stubborn refusal to support private broadcasters is making the media crisis worse?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my Bloc Québécois colleague, but the Bloc is acting like a pyromaniac firefighter on this issue. First, it is sounding the fire alarm and then it is adding fuel to the fire.

The Bloc Québécois voted against a budget that would invest \$38 million in local media and \$150 million in CBC/Radio-Canada. That would help our media outlets across the country and help the production of local culture in Quebec and across the country. They voted against that.

• (1440)

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is a rather odd analogy coming from a former environmentalist.

The government has just abolished the digital services tax, which could have financed a fund to support a diversity of information sources and Quebec culture. The government is doing nothing for private broadcasters. When questioned, it says that it is funding the public sector, as if the entire broadcasting system is public, and too bad for the private sector. This prompted columnist Yasmine Adelfadel to say that the minister is insulting the TVA workers who lost their jobs.

What do we need to say to the minister to get him to take action for our private broadcasters?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the budget presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance and National Revenue, includes tax credits for local journalism. They voted against it. There is money for a local journalism initiative. The Bloc Québécois voted against it. There is \$150 million for our public broadcaster. The Bloc Québécois voted against it. It is the largest producer of culture in Quebec. The Bloc Québécois voted against it. My colleague has the audacity to stand up in the House and tell us that we are not here for journalists and culture. It is absolutely outrageous.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is no longer a secret that we are dealing with the most expensive government in Canadian history. Every dollar lavishly spent by the Prime Minister comes out of the pockets of Canadians. The problem is that there is no money left in Canadians' pockets. One-quarter of Canadians are facing food insecurity, which means that they cannot afford groceries.

In the last budget, the Prime Minister chose to raise the cost of fuel with hidden taxes. Why do the Liberals want to make food even more expensive for Canadians who already cannot afford it?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always fascinating to hear the Conservatives repeat their leader's talking points day after day and go on about imaginary taxes.

They had the opportunity to vote for tax cuts for 22 million Canadians and a school food program for the most vulnerable youth. They had the opportunity to support investments in defence, in productivity and in infrastructure such as the Port of Québec and the Port of Saguenay. They had the opportunity to support defence investments in industries like the Davie shipyard near Quebec City.

When it came time to vote for all these measures, they were nowhere to be found. They could not bring themselves to vote in favour of these measures, which is unfortunate. I encourage them to get their act together.

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has just given an endless list of expenses that this government has imposed on Canadians in the latest budget. That is what it means to be a Liberal.

Meanwhile, what is happening? More and more Canadians are being forced to use their credit cards to buy food. They have to eat

on credit. They have to drain their bank accounts to eat. For 80% of people, the cost of food is breaking their budget.

The Prime Minister keeps spending and driving up the cost of food. Why are the Liberals so determined to impoverish Canadians when a quarter of them are already too poor to put food on the table?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is mind-boggling to hear the opposition member talk about endless spending when what he is referring to are things like the Canada child benefit, which has reduced child poverty by 40% in Canada and which helps tens of thousands of Canadians in his own riding. He also talked about the Canadian dental care plan, which, again, helps hundreds of thousands of Canadians, including tens of thousands in his own riding. It is shameful.

I would encourage him to come to his senses and support us. I know that, deep down, he was probably quite happy that his leader was hiding behind the curtains and that he hoped that the budget would pass because he knows it is a good budget.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Liberals narrowly passed the biggest deficit budget in Canadian history. They are recklessly spending the money of future generations.

This morning, we learned that groceries is the area where 80% of Canadians are being squeezed the most in their budgets. In addition, 25% of households are struggling to put food on the table and are suffering from food insecurity. To make matters worse, the Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed that hidden Liberal taxes will increase the cost at the pump by 17¢ a litre.

Given that families can no longer make ends meet, why do the Liberals keep adding hidden taxes that are driving up the cost of food?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that Canadians are having a hard time, but the important thing is to give them back their purchasing power. We are doing that in so many different ways, such as by supporting families, the school food program, dental care and pharmacare. These are all ways we are giving purchasing power back to Canadians.

I have not even touched on all the investments that will create good, well-paying jobs. That is what it means to build Canada and address the current crisis.

● (1445)

[English]

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians and drives up the cost of everything, especially food.

Oral Questions

At the St. Thomas Elgin Food Bank, there is record demand. Four out of five Canadians say that food is their top expense pressure, and the Liberals are standing by their industrial carbon tax, which makes it more expensive to grow, ship and sell food. Not only are the Liberals not scrapping it; they are increasing it. Why is the Prime Minister making life more expensive for Canadians when they cannot even get by as it is?

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, that is a bit rich coming from Poilievre's biographer, but let us talk—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Members are not supposed to do that. The hon. member knows that, and the hon. member is an experienced politician and has been on the Hill for a long time.

She may continue, however. The hon. member.

Leslie Church: Mr. Speaker, let us talk about two of the main areas of costs for families; let us talk about taxes and let us talk about housing.

The budget cuts taxes for 22 million Canadians, bringing the basic tax rate down from 15% to 14%. This is a major tax cut. It is about \$5 billion a year in tax relief for Canadians, and 85% goes to the lowest income tax brackets alone.

With regard to housing, we are making the biggest investment in housing in Canadian history. We are building up the supply of homes, bringing down—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the plug for my book. If the member were to read books instead of talking points, the country would be in a better place.

Food prices have risen almost 40% faster in Canada than in the United States. Beef is up 17% and chicken is up 6.2%, and now the Liberals are adding a fuel tax that will make gas 17¢ a litre more expensive. Driving in my riding and in rural Canada is not a luxury; it is a necessity. A tax on gas is a tax on life.

When will the Liberals get real and make life more affordable?

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, I think it depends on the types of books a member might want to read.

Let us talk about books. This week in the House, the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations has been on the Hill representing students from across the land. Here is what Abdul Abbasi, the Chair of CASA and a student from the University of Alberta, had to say about the budget: “Students are pleased to see that the government has met CASA’s call for tens of thousands of student jobs in growing economic sectors.”

This budget is for students, so if the member opposite wants to talk about how education builds—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brampton Centre.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Amandeep Sodhi (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians deserve to feel safe within their communities. We have critical legislation before the House that is getting stalled by Conservative political antics.

Will the Minister of Public Safety tell Canadians what our government is doing to combat extortion, strengthen enforcement and protect Canadians across this country?

● (1450)

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me thank the member for Brampton Centre for her incredible hard work and advocacy.

Our government is taking real action to stop people who commit extortion. The Conservatives, however, have failed to support measures, like lawful access, that law enforcement across Canada have been asking us to implement. They will not support Bill C-2. They will not support Bill C-12. They will not support Bill C-14. They will not support hiring 1,000 new RCMP personnel and 1,000 new CBSA officers.

Canadians expect their opposition to work together with their government. Let us stop the rhetoric—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are running government like a travelling circus.

Take the F-35 procurement, for example. Justin Trudeau said that he would never buy the F-35s, but then the Liberals ordered the F-35s later. Now the Prime Minister has started another review. The Minister of National Defence said that the review would be done by the end of last summer, but the Secretary of State for Defence Procurement says there is no rush. Meanwhile, nobody can figure out what the Minister of Industry is actually doing.

Once and for all, when will this unnecessary review finally end? Who in the government is actually in charge of buying fighter jets?

Oral Questions

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as part of our generational investments in the Canadian Armed Forces, we are procuring a new fleet of fighter aircraft for the Royal Canadian Air Force. We review all procurement approaches responsibly to align with the best interests of Canadians and the needs of the CAF. We are committed to procuring what the Air Force needs, while ensuring economic benefits for Canadians.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister has said that he would take the lead from the Canadian Armed Forces and experts. Well, military experts could not be more clear: Buy the F-35s.

The minister's chief of the defence staff said it, his commander of the Air Force has said it, his deputy minister has said it and now over a dozen retired Air Force generals have said it. By dragging on this unnecessary review, the Liberals are undermining our national security and our reputation with our allies

When will the defence minister finally listen to the experts and buy all 88 F-35s that our pilots need in order to defend Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the answer.

We are in the process of procuring a new fleet of fighter aircraft for the Royal Canadian Air Force. We review all procurement approaches to ensure they are aligned with the interests of Canadians and the needs of the Canadian Armed Forces. We are committed to procuring what the air force needs, while ensuring economic benefits for Canadians. It is that simple.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday a shocking exposé by Global News outlined how in 2016 the Liberals allowed a Syrian national named Omar Alkassab, who is a financier of Hamas, to claim refugee status in Canada.

On Tuesday officials revealed that the Liberals have launched a one-touch program that allows refugee claimants, when entering Canada, to self-declare whether or not they are terrorists.

How many Hamas operatives and other terrorists have the Liberals granted refugee status to in the last 10 years?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would urge colleagues across the way to think twice about putting on the floor of the House of Commons unverified reports from anonymous sources.

Security is of paramount importance in this country. That is a sacrosanct principle upheld by successive Conservative and Liberal governments. We maintain that principle from start to finish.

As for the comments about the program that was talked about at the immigration committee, the member knows better.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for those listening at home, that translates to “They do not know.”

Global News also reported that an astonishing 450 people with assorted roles in Hamas now have ties to Canada. Last week, in response to an official request, the minister was unable to say how many non-citizen criminals and terrorists the Liberals have granted status to, and now Global News is revealing that the terrorist financier has already passed the citizenship test and is awaiting a final decision.

How many other terrorists are the Liberals in the process of granting citizenship to?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member continues to cite anonymous sources on the floor of the House of Commons.

The reality is that security remains always a fundamental responsibility that we take seriously. When security agencies become aware of potential threats to this country, they act accordingly. We trust them to do that.

As for the point that was raised before, relating to what was discussed this week at the immigration committee, I say that the member knows better, because she knows very well that our security system is not upheld by an app, and that criminality checks and national security checks, all of these checks, are carried out before anyone is allowed in this country.

* * *

● (1455)

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that the biggest threat to the security of Canada is Beijing's foreign interference.

Parliament passed a law to create a registry to combat this interference a year and a half ago. The government said it would be up and running by year-end. The government must consult with opposition leaders and introduce a motion to appoint a commissioner.

There are only three weeks left before Christmas adjournment. When will the government consult opposition leaders and introduce a motion to appoint a commissioner?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member, as well the House, that we will be moving forward in short order to bring forward the name to the opposition and to have a motion before the House.

Oral Questions

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the last election, some candidates were vetoed for foreign interference, and others were targeted. CSIS Director Dan Rogers said just last week that China and Russia continue to target Canada. We have had one federal election without a registry, and we could have a second one, at the speed that the government operates.

Where is the sense of urgency in getting the registry up and running? Where are the speeds not seen in generations? Where are the consultations with opposition leaders? Where is the motion?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to thank the men and women of CSIS for the work they do each and every day to protect Canadians.

I also want to once again assure my colleague opposite that we will be bringing forward a name in short order and that we will ensure that adequate consultation comes before the House.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion threats in British Columbia are up 481% since 2015. The Liberals voted against our Conservative plan a year ago that would have tackled this crisis with mandatory jail time and removing house arrest as an option for extortion with a firearm. Since their refusal to act, thousands of new extortion cases have exploded across Canada.

What do the Liberals have to say to the businesses and the victims of crime who have suffered due to their inaction?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we have to say to Canadians is that we have a bill in front of the House, Bill C-2, that has a very important provision called lawful access, which would ensure that crimes such as extortion are dealt with in an efficient and speedy manner. This is what law enforcement across Canada, from Abbotsford to every part of the country I have visited over the last six months, has been asking for. It is a component of the bill that is so essential.

However, the party opposite has continuously refused to bring forward and accept lawful access as a very basic principle of Canadian criminal law.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the city of Vaughan, York Regional Police recently charged a local man with four counts of extortion. This is just one case among countless all across the country. In fact extortion is up 330% since 2015 all across the country, but despite this, the current Liberal Minister of Justice voted against our Conservative plan to end the extortion crisis last year. The Liberals could have been proactive and supported our plan a year ago, but instead they waited for the fire to get out of control.

Will the Liberals apologize to the thousands of victims who had to suffer because of their inaction?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always funny when I hear the critic for immigration talking

in the House about immigration, when they systematically slapped down any possibility of improving our immigration system prior to the last election.

Now the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge stands up and dares to ask what tools we are putting in place to prevent extortion. He is in the way. Tell the whip to get his boot off the neck of Bill C-2 so we can give lawful access provisions to our police to prevent, detain, arrest and jail extortionists in this country.

• (1500)

Amanpreet Gill (Calgary Skyview, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion in Canada has exploded by 330% since 2015. Canadians are being terrorized. People are dying. Homes are being sprayed with bullets. What do the Liberals do? Nothing. In Calgary, a woman who was convicted of helping with extortion walked away with just six months of house arrest, all because of Liberal soft-on-crime policies. We presented our Conservative plan a year ago, and Liberals voted it down.

What does the minister have to say to the victims about his inaction?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what needs to happen is that the rhetoric from across the aisle needs to stop.

What we need to do is right in front of the House. We have Bill C-2, which has lawful access as a very important principle of criminal law. We have Bill C-12, the strong borders act, and we have Bill C-14, which speaks to the need for bail reform as well as sentencing. These are smart criminal justice reforms that are meant to keep Canadians safe, including Canadians who are experiencing extortion.

It is time to get serious and time for the Conservative Party to come forward and pass the legislation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public transit is critically important to reducing congestion, supporting economic growth and improving the quality of life of Canadians in urban centres across the country. Last week's announcement regarding the REM project in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles is important for the greater Montreal area.

Can the minister tell the House how this project will improve public transit and support our efforts to build a cleaner, better-connected future?

*Oral Questions***Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, the REM represents a milestone for sustainable transportation in Montreal and for Quebec as a whole. The opening of the Deux-Montagnes line will change the way more than 170,000 people, including families, workers and students, get around every day. The REM will generate major economic spinoffs, including the creation of 1,000 permanent jobs over time. It will also help reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 100,000 tonnes per year. This is an ambitious project that Quebecers deserve and that is worthy of a strong Canada.

* * *

*[English]***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Look out, Mr. Speaker; there he goes again. It seems like the Prime Minister just cannot wait to jump on a plane and leave the country any opportunity he gets. He has been everywhere. He has been to the U.S. twice, then to Italy, Mexico, Poland, Belgium, the Netherlands and so many other countries right across the globe, and now he is back to the U.A.E. However, Canadians are worse off than ever as the cost of living skyrockets faster than the Prime Minister's air miles.

Can the Liberals name one tariff that has been reduced because of all that travel?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are taking a team Canada approach to opening new global markets for Canadian workers and businesses. The member opposite should talk to Conservative premiers who applaud the Prime Minister's leadership on the world stage. Let me quote Premier Moe: "we welcome [the Prime Minister's] efforts to raise Canada's credibility in the international sphere." Premier Doug Ford thanked the Prime Minister for "getting Canada out front."

Now is not the time to retreat behind curtains like some of the members opposite do. It is time to lean forward and build Canada strong.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like any progress on reducing tariffs for Canadians is still up in the air, just like the Prime Minister. There are zero results, and zero tariffs have been removed. That is not good enough, not when investment in Canada is down \$47.6 billion, when our country has the worst per capita growth in the G7 and when Canadian families are struggling to eat and heat and house themselves.

Is the Prime Minister always travelling so he does not have to see the consequences his failures have brought on this country?

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 reading his air miles plan, why do you not read the budget? The only word the opposition seems to know is no. It is time to—

The Speaker: I am not going to comment on what I have read recently in the budget, but if the hon. member could go through the Chair, he may continue.

Hon. Evan Solomon: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for counting air miles instead of reading the budget.

The only word the opposition seems to know is no. It is time to say yes to building Canada. It is time to say yes to the national school food program. They said no. It is time to say yes to building affordable homes. They said no. It is time to say yes to investing in our national defence. They said no.

It is time to say yes and build Canada strong.

● (1505)

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every time the Prime Minister is wheels up, Canadian bank accounts go down. The Prime Minister has taken 28 trips, travelling far enough to circle Earth almost four times. What do Canadians have to show for it? There are no new trade deals and no concrete wins, just photo ops, fancy meetings and hollow letters of intent that never turn into real results. He met with China: higher tariffs on canola. He visited India: tariffs on yellow peas. He had meetings in Washington: higher tariffs on softwood. He had meetings in the U.K.: crickets for beef and pork.

Is he even trying to get tariffs removed, or is he just racking up more Brookfield—I mean air miles?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know two-thirds of our economy is powered by trade. We are opening doors for Canadian products to reach new markets. We have signed new trade deals with Ecuador and Indonesia. We wrapped up an investment agreement with the U.A.E. We are advancing negotiations with ASEAN, the Philippines and Thailand. We have a bill before the House to expand our trade ties with the U.K.

We are laser-focused on opening new markets for Canadian workers and businesses.

* * *

SPORT

Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last weekend was a defining moment for sport in Canada as the Northern Super League, our country's first professional women's soccer league, held its inaugural championship final at BMO Field in my riding of Spadina—Harbourfront.

Oral Questions

Can the Secretary of State for Sport share with Canadians how our government is investing in women's sport, including with the recent \$5.4-million commitment to the Northern Super League, to boost local economies and bring communities together?

Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague from Spadina—Harbourfront is somebody who knows a thing or two about the fight for gender equity in sport and beyond.

We are seeing remarkable progress and momentum in women's professional sport across this country. A smart, sustainable business model has built the Northern Super League, and it is redefining what is possible in Canada with professional women's sport. That is why five of Canada's regional economic development agencies have come together to back the Northern Super League. With strategic federal support of up to \$5.45 million, we are helping to strengthen the league's foundation and create new opportunities for fans, communities and athletes nationwide.

I want to congratulate the Vancouver Rise on winning the Diana B. Matheson Cup—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara South.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has circled the globe four times, meeting with world leaders for photo ops, meaningless letters of intent and zero investments. He has returned with nothing, and after 28 trips, Canadians are fed up.

After meeting with China, China imposed more tariffs. After meeting with India, India imposed more tariffs. When he went to the U.K., there were crickets. He went to Washington and Trump imposed more tariffs.

Why is it that whenever the Prime Minister hops on a plane for another photo op, Canadian families get stuck with higher tariffs?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to end question period, at least for this Conservative question, with this. We started question period talking about a very unfortunate quote by the member for Calgary Midnapore. I want to draw members' attention to a quote from the member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke that I do not think really elevates the nature of debate in this House. She said, in referring to the budget, "They would rather die than suffer the way the Liberal government has been making them suffer."

I would invite the member to retract her comment. I do not think these excesses of language and quite obviously patently false entries into debate serve anyone.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. We will have to deal with this afterward.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister is in the United Arab Emirates, horrific massacres are being committed in Sudan. The Rapid Support Forces, or RSF, supplied with weapons by the United Arab Emirates, have killed thousands of civilians, and Canadian weapons are reportedly being used in these atrocities.

Canada exports millions of dollars worth of arms to the United Arab Emirates. Will the Prime Minister halt these arms shipments and suspend Canadian defence co-operation with that country until it stops supporting the RSF in Sudan? Or will Canada—

• (1510)

The Speaker: The sound cut off. Could the member start again midway through?

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister is in the United Arab Emirates, horrific massacres are being committed in Sudan. The Rapid Support Forces, or RSF, supplied with weapons by the United Arab Emirates, have killed thousands of civilians, and Canadian weapons are reportedly being used in these atrocities.

Canada exports millions of dollars worth of arms to the United Arab Emirates. Will the Prime Minister halt these arms shipments and suspend Canadian defence co-operation with that country until it stops supporting the RSF in Sudan? Or will Canada remain complicit in another horrific war?

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada condemns the civil war and violence currently ravaging Sudan. It needs to stop. We are horrified by the recent attacks in El Fasher and condemn the alleged massacre of more than 2,000 civilians. We urge all parties to respect international law, protect civilians and immediately allow humanitarian aid to have unimpeded access.

Canada will continue to support the Sudanese people, as it has done since the beginning of the conflict.

* * *

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, the government has legal obligations to first nations children, but the minister has stopped doing the work. This inaction is costing children their lives. The National Children's Chiefs Commission is being ignored. The Liberals would rather pay lawyers to fight with first nations children.

Will the minister commit to permanently stopping the discrimination against first nations children or will she continue to make lawyers rich?

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first nations children need to be guided by self-determination, and that is the pull we are using to proceed with this work. I have on multiple occasions met with many people looking to serve, and bring forward solutions for, indigenous children in community.

What I invite my colleague to do with me is find a path forward and respond to the urgency that is needed in this file for solutions that will deliver the proper care for children surrounded by their families, in community, in their own language and by those who care for them the most.

The Speaker: On a point of order, the hon. member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to an earlier point. I was relaying what my constituent said to me when the government first announced it might allow people suffering from mental illness to apply for MAID. She told her doctor that as soon as it is available, she wanted to be euthanized because she could not bear being unable to eat, pay the rent or pay for heat.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think this is really important, because the member does owe an apology, not to the House of Commons but to Canadians. The member said there are “older people who cannot pay the rent or the electricity—

The Speaker: That is debate. We are slipping into debate. The House leader brought this up during question period, so I permitted the member to attempt to clarify. I consider this case closed, to be honest.

* * *

● (1515)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is time for everyone's favourite part of the parliamentary cycle, the Thursday question. I was wondering if the government could inform the House of the business for the rest of this week and into next week.

I have a couple of quick questions about the agenda. There has been a lot of talk about a proposed pipeline through British Columbia to the west coast. Of course, that would be useless if the Liberal shipping ban stays in place. Lifting that ban will require legislation.

Does the government intend to bring in legislation to end that double-standard law that prevents Canadian ships from transporting Canadian energy but allows U.S. tankers to travel through the same area?

The opposition has now been asking for weeks for an emergency take-note debate on the trade impacts of the government's failures to get tariffs lifted, specifically on softwood lumber. We have proposed holding a take-note debate next week. I wonder if the government will accept that request, listen to the thousands of Canadian workers who have lost their jobs because of the devastation that has affected the softwood lumber industry and grant that emergency take-note debate for sometime next week.

Government Orders

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and answer the Thursday question on behalf of the government House leader, as the deputy House leader.

Of course, there has been a lot of discussion this week, but, most importantly, what I have heard from Canadians is that they really want to talk about the budget that we put forward, which many members of this House voted on. Lots of Canadians want to talk about the jobs that will be created through the budget and the affordability measures that are in the budget to help Canadians move forward.

This afternoon, we will continue the debate on second reading of Bill C-15, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget. We will resume debate on the bill tomorrow, as well as next Monday and Tuesday. On Wednesday and Thursday of next week, we will call second reading of debate of Bill C-13, an act to implement the protocol on the accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I would also like to inform the House that there will be a ministerial statement on Tuesday, November 25, which is the first day of the 16 days of activism against gender-based violence.

[Translation]

Finally, I would like to seek unanimous consent for the following motion: That, pursuant to subsection 24(1) of the Building Canada Act and section 62 of the Emergencies Act, a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to review the Governor in Council's and the minister's exercise of their powers and performance of their duties and functions under the—

Some hon. members: No.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation act. It is a budget for a moment of profound global change. This is not a routine budget; it is a blueprint for generational transformation, a plan that would define Canada's future for decades to come. We are laying the foundation for a modern, secure and competitive Canada in the 21st century, future-proofing our economy while protecting our people, and we are doing so by making bold, responsible choices.

Government Orders

We will build the infrastructure, the homes and the industries that drive long-term prosperity. We will protect our communities and uphold our values, and we will empower Canadians, especially young people, with better careers, strong public services and a more affordable life. In a time of global uncertainty, Canada will not stand still. We choose to lead. We choose to build. With U.S. tariffs rising and global supply chains shifting, how we invest in Canadian infrastructure and manufacturing will shape our competitiveness and resilience for a generation. That is why the budget focuses on what we can control: building our economy here at home, stronger and faster than ever before. We are cutting waste and redirecting resources toward smart, generational investments that will grow our economy, protect communities and empower Canadians. This is our moment to build big, build bold and build now.

In times of economic uncertainty, when families across Canada are facing high rents, rising food prices and mounting child care costs, Canadians need to know that their government is protecting the programs that make life possible. These are not luxuries; these are essential for all Canadians. Toronto's families know that child care costs have historically been among the highest in the country, but investing in child care has changed that. Budget 2025 would protect the national child care program, ensuring that parents in Spadina—Harbourfront and across Canada can continue to access good-quality care. This is not just social policy; it is economic policy, enabling more parents, especially women, to participate more fully in the workforce.

We are also investing in our new Canadian dental care plan, one of the largest expansions of health care in a generation, and it is already transforming lives. Thousands of my constituents, including children, seniors living on a fixed income and low-income families, have been able to visit a dentist for the first time in years. Access to oral health is not a luxury. This is more than coverage; it is prevention. Untreated dental issues lead to pain, illness, ER visits, and missed work and school. By introducing the Canadian dental care plan, we are saving families money, reducing pressure on our health care system and protecting long-term health outcomes.

Budget 2025 would also maintain and strengthen the Canada child benefit, a lifeline for families in Toronto, where housing and food costs are among the highest in Canada. At a time of tough fiscal choices, our government chose to protect families and the services they rely on. That is leadership Canadians deserve and expect. Many parents rely on the Canada child benefit to make life more affordable. This benefit helps cover essentials, such as groceries, clothing and school supplies, the things that make raising children possible. We know this: When we invest in children, we do not just help families; we build a stronger, more resilient economy and community. We are not stopping there. We are simplifying access through automatic benefit systems, so the families who need support most receive it without barriers. From employment insurance enhancements to the permanent national school food program, the budget would reinforce the social infrastructure that keeps Canadians secure.

Protection alone is not enough. In a world of uncertainty, we cannot simply hold the line; we must move forward boldly. That is why the BIA, Bill C-15, and budget 2025 would launch the most

ambitious building agenda in generations. To secure our future, we must build it, and we are building Canada strong.

When I was knocking on doors just seven months ago, I heard about the same two issues again and again: affordable housing and transit. Residents have told me time and time again that we need homes we can afford and we need transit that gets us where we need to go. These are daily realities for the people of Spadina—Harbourfront. In our city, we understand what it means to grow. We know how to live close together. We know how to thrive in dense, vibrant, connected communities. Because we know how to live together, we can lead together. Toronto can be a model for urban growth and for how cities build more neighbours, not more barriers. Through the build communities strong fund, we have committed \$51 billion over 10 years to infrastructure. For Toronto, that means continued and expanded investments in transit, green infrastructure and community facilities, projects that make our city more livable, sustainable and connected.

The budget also responds boldly to the housing crisis, with \$25 billion in housing commitments, including the launch of Build Canada Homes, backed by \$13 billion to accelerate construction using modern, modular and sustainable methods. Build Canada Homes would double the pace of homebuilding, powered by Canadian technology, Canadian workers and Canadian innovation.

● (1520)

Our focus is clear: We will build more non-market, affordable community housing to meet a range of needs. We will build for families, for seniors, for students, for workers and for those at risk of homelessness. We will work with the provinces, municipalities, indigenous communities, mission-driven housing providers, non-profits, co-operatives and organizations serving women, newcomers, people with disabilities and those needing supportive housing.

The math is simple. When we build more, supply increases. When supply increases, more Canadians can find a place to call home.

Government Orders

Budget 2025 is not just about building houses. It is about building opportunity. For many young professionals and families in Toronto, buying a first home has felt simply out of reach. We are eliminating the GST on new homes, including condos, up to \$1 million, making home ownership more attainable for more younger Canadians.

The budget is a generational investment strategy designed to unlock \$1 trillion in private sector investment and position Canada for success in a world where resilience is economic strength. We are not just building for today. We are building for the next generation. We are building Canada strong. Budget 2025 is not only about building homes and infrastructure. It is about building the heart and soul of our country. The arts and culture sector is central to building the strongest and most resilient economy in the G7. It is how we tell our story. It is how we protect our sovereignty in a world where culture is influence.

By investing in the institutions that carry Canada's diverse stories to the world, we protect our cultural sovereignty, reinforce national unity and project our values across the world. Canada's values are rooted in our shared identity and deep connection to community. We have so much to be proud of, to celebrate and to defend.

That is why budget 2025 would make one of the largest investments in arts and culture in our history, with \$769.3 million over four years to strengthen Canada's creative economy, support storytelling and journalism, and bring Canadians together through national celebrations and shared moments of pride.

The budget would also renew the Canada Strong pass. Families and young people will have free or discounted access to national parks, museums, galleries and rail travel, giving more Canadians the chance to explore our country and experience our history. Canada's artists, musicians, filmmakers, publishers and writers are at the heart of our creative economy. They are job creators, innovators, entrepreneurs and ambassadors for Canada on the world stage.

I am proud that Spadina—Harbourfront is home to the headquarters of the CBC, an institution that connects Canadians from coast to coast. It protects our official languages and strengthens our cultural sovereignty. Budget 2025 would strengthen CBC/Radio-Canada's mandate and modernize its role in the digital age, ensuring that Canadian stories continue to be told by Canadians, for Canadians and to the world.

The arts and culture sector is not an afterthought. It is an economic driver. It is a nation-building sector. It fuels tourism, attracts investment and showcases Canada's excellence on the world stage. From a recent report by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, we know that over the past three years, the sector has grown nearly twice as fast as the broader economy; cultural exports have reached a record \$25 billion, and GDP from the sector has risen almost 8%. It now supports more jobs per dollar than oil and gas, manufacturing or agriculture, and it generates \$17 billion in government tax revenue. The return on public investment is extraordinary. For every dollar the federal government invests, the arts and culture sector generates \$29 in economic activity.

Supporting arts is not a luxury. It is a strategic investment in economic strength, national unity and Canadian sovereignty. When we

invest in the creative economy, we are not only creating jobs; we are protecting our identity and strengthening Canada's voice in the world.

Budget 2025 is a plan to build, protect and empower. It would protect the social programs that families rely on. It would build the homes, infrastructure and industries our communities need. It would empower Canadians and our cultural sector to tell Canada's story to the world. For Spadina—Harbourfront, for Toronto and for all Canadians, this is a budget to prepare us for a stronger, more resilient future.

• (1525)

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Before I begin, I want to recognize a very special birthday for a resident of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, and that is the 40th birthday of my friend and a wonderful lawyer, Greg Thompson. I wish him and his family all the best on his 40th.

I listened to my colleague's speech, and I do not believe we have had the opportunity to have an intervention with one another in the House.

We talk about the budget; the budget is adding a tax base of \$5,400 of debt for every family.

How is that tenable? When are we ever going to dig out of this debt, which will cripple future generations?

Chi Nguyen: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question is a very thoughtful one. Our government has taken a very prudent, smart and responsible approach to how we are delivering the budget, our first budget under the Carney government. We are making choices—

The Deputy Speaker: The member cannot use the Prime Minister's last name or first name in the House of Commons.

I will return the time to the member if she can finish.

Chi Nguyen: Mr. Speaker, with our new government, the choices we are making are about protecting the social infrastructure and the core pieces I know my residents in Spadina—Harbourfront talk about as really key to securing their future: the programs and the social infrastructure. These are the choices we are making as a government to continue to support Canadians.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear my colleague speak about culture in the House.

Government Orders

In Quebec, we fully appreciate that our cultural sector contributes to our economy. While we are on the topic of culture, I would like to hear the member's thoughts on the issue of discoverability and, better yet, the connection between democracy and strong local media.

Unfortunately, while the government prides itself on supporting the cultural sector, it has completely abandoned local media. These outlets help promote local artists and get people interested in municipal politics, which upholds democracy at the local level. Unfortunately, the government has completely abandoned this diversity of viewpoints and this media diversity. It has not announced anything for community media or local media.

Of course, it boasts about allocating \$38 million to the local journalism initiative. In my region, La Voix de l'Est and other media outlets like Le Val-Ouest use these funds, and that is appreciated. However, that is not going to ensure the survival of community media and private media in the regions.

Chi Nguyen: Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for her question.

[English]

I know that the work of local democracy and local journalism is critical for storytelling and for the information ecosystem we need in this country. That is why we have committed \$37 million to the local journalism fund. That kind of investment will strengthen democracy and ensure that Canadians have access to high-quality local news that will allow us to understand what is happening in our country.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech in support of the budget was excellent.

I represent an urban riding in Hamilton, and there is some really exciting funding in the budget specifically for municipalities and large urban centres, with \$51 billion for infrastructure and \$13 billion for housing. Of course municipalities in Ontario have deliberately been chronically underfunded by the provincial government.

My question to the member is this: What specific provisions in the budget does she see benefiting urban areas?

Chi Nguyen: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question about what is needed in urban centres was a very thoughtful one. I certainly have a very urban and dense riding in Spadina—Harbourfront.

Something I know Canadians care about and Torontonians care about deeply is how we move around the city and how we invest in transit mobility. The infrastructure investments we are making as part of the \$51 billion are investments in green infrastructure and public transit, which will alleviate some of the pain points Torontonians are feeling in our communities today.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation act.

On November 4, a couple of weeks ago, the new Minister of Finance, the fourth one since the Liberal Party formed government 10 years ago, presented his first budget, an \$80-billion-deficit budget. I

have been a member of Parliament for six years now, and I have seen five budgets. All of them have consistently disappointed us.

I ran for public office in 2019, largely on account of Liberal budgeting disasters. I remember that in 2015, when Justin Trudeau was the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, he ran on a promise that there were going to be some small to medium-sized deficits for three years, 2016, 2017 and 2018, but by year four of that mandate, 2019, the economy would have improved, and he was going to present a balanced budget.

That did not happen at all. The deficits happened for sure, but by 2019 Mr. Trudeau was saying not to worry about the budget and that "the budget will balance itself." That is when I woke up to realize I could not just sit back complaining anymore. I had to jump in to the fray and try to do something about it, so I ran in 2019 under the Conservative banner in the hope that we were going to form government and turn the ship around.

Unfortunately the Liberals won again. This time it was a minority government, and the wasteful inflationary spending continued year after year. During the next few years, the Liberals doubled the national debt from \$600 billion to \$1.2 trillion. Most people have trouble understanding those big numbers. I certainly do; that is a lot of zeroes.

I remember one late-night debate in the middle of the pandemic, when we were debating pandemic spending by the government. Our current party leader, who was then the member of Parliament for Carleton and our finance critic, asked the then finance minister a hypothetical question: What if interest rates were to go up 1%? What would that cost in extra interest payments to service the debt? At that time, our debt was projected to be \$1 trillion dollars. She refused to answer, so the former member for Carleton kept asking the question, and she kept refusing to answer it.

I pulled out my little calculator because I was curious to see what the answer was, but there were not enough digit spaces on my calculator, so I got out my pen and paper and wrote it out: Multiply \$1 trillion by 1%, then move the decimal place over two points to the left, which is \$10 billion. The then finance minister refused to answer, because she knew the answer; it is not hard.

I realized at the time that this is real debt, despite what the then finance minister was saying. She was accusing the then member for Carleton of fearmongering, saying not to worry about it, that interest rates are low, money is free, we should borrow everything that we can to invest in Canadians, and that inflation will never happen. That was only three or four years ago.

One thing that is absolutely true is that the debt is real debt. Another \$80 billion is being added to it, and our total debt is going to be \$1.35 trillion over the next couple of years.

I have a couple of examples to understand these very big numbers. One is to recognize that the servicing debt is \$55 billion, which is more than the federal government pays in health transfers. It is also more than we spend on national defence. These are real numbers, and they are having real, negative impacts on our ability to run a profitable economy.

To help understand the numbers a bit better, I will say that the amount of money to service the debt, not even to pay it down but just to pay the interest on it, is more than the government collects in HST. Every time we go to the store, pull out a credit card to purchase something and take a look at what the receipt says, the amount of HST is going to bankers and bondholders instead of to health care, to doctors and nurses.

The Liberals on the other side of the House, who think they are helping Canadians by going deeper into debt, will have this to say: “Do not worry, 22 million Canadians are getting a tax cut.” It is a very modest tax cut. I am sure it will be appreciated, but it will be roughly enough money for a family to be able to take the kids to McDonald's once a week. That is not the answer, and people are concerned.

• (1535)

I have a few emails, quotes from people in my riding who are deeply concerned about the financial viability of this country. Erika writes this: “In the latest budget, the Liberals want astoundingly high federal expenditures which will leave our economy in shambles.”

Joe writes, “The amount of the predicted deficit is completely out of control. Not only is the current generation getting [short-changed], the next two or three generations are never going to be able to dig themselves out of this horrific hole. You are using tomorrow's money to pay yesterday's bills.”

Here is one more, from Deborah: “We now pay more weekly in debt servicing interest payments, than our [government] pays for medical transfers to the provinces.... That's a lot of potential hospitals burned up in smoke every week.”

I know that the Liberals will tell these people not to worry about debt, that it does not matter, but Canadians are not fooled that easily.

I want to address two things I have heard many times from Liberal members of the House, on the stats they use to brush aside these concerns. First, the Liberals say that Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio is pretty good, perhaps the best in the world, but one thing they forget to do, probably intentionally but maybe inadvertently, is to add subnational debt. The provinces have debt too, and if we add that in, our debt is actually twice as big.

The second macro issue that Liberals like to sweep under the carpet is our lagging productivity numbers, which matter because productivity is the best measure of a nation's ability to create wealth, which then gets passed on to its citizens. To the credit of previous finance ministers, they have recognized this as a problem.

Government Orders

In her 2022 budget speech, this is what the former minister of finance said:

Our third pillar for growth is a plan to tackle the Achilles heel of the Canadian economy: productivity and innovation....

However, we are falling behind when it comes to economic productivity. Productivity matters because it is what guarantees the dream of every parent—that our children will be more prosperous than we are. This is a well-known Canadian problem and an insidious one. It is time for Canada to tackle it.

The same former minister of finance, a couple of years later in the 2024 budget speech, said:

The third part of our plan is growing the economy in a way that is shared by everyone.

To drive the kind of growth Canada needs today, we are redoubling our efforts to attract investment, increase productivity and boost innovation.

Most recently, in the 2025 budget speech just a couple of weeks ago, the current finance minister had this to say about productivity: The government is fully focused “on boosting productivity—doing more with less—because that is the best way to raise [the] standard of living.” I agree with that, and I applaud them for at least recognizing that there is a problem.

I want to point out that I am splitting my time with the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.

Why does productivity matter? Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman said this many years ago, and it is a good quote: “Productivity isn't everything, but, in the long run, it is almost everything.”

It is just like for a family; the more take-home pay there is, the better the family is able to service its debt or pay the mortgage. It is the same with a business; the more profitable it is, the more it can manage its debt and grow its business. Debt is not a bad thing; it is the inability to be able to service debt that is the bad thing. When the federal government is spending more on debt servicing than they are on health care transfers, we have a problem. To quote Deborah once again, “That's a lot of potential hospitals burned up in smoke every week.”

I have been here for six years, and in all that time, things have not improved despite the government's promising that it was going to improve productivity. The time is now.

Government Orders

• (1540)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to Canada and the whole deficit and debt situation. It is important to recognize that when we look at G7 countries, we are number one on debt. We are number two, I believe, on the deficit situation. We have a AAA credit rating. In fact, if we compared Canada's deficit this year to the deficit in 2009, when the member's leader sat in the Conservative caucus, and we factored in inflation, the leader of the Conservative Party's caucus back then would have had a higher deficit.

I wonder if he could provide his thoughts on that.

Tako Van Popta: Mr. Speaker, this is what we have been hearing from Liberal members of Parliament. They are saying our debt-to-GDP ratio is not as bad as the ratios in other countries. If we add in the subnational debt, it is. It does not look nearly as good as they like to say it is.

I am going to go back to my points about productivity. Debt is not necessarily bad. It is not necessarily bad for a business if it is used to grow, but what if it cannot service the debt? At what expense is the debt being serviced? Is it at the expense of health care? That is a reality in this country. It is a problem that needs to be tackled.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague and I know that the border security issue is especially important to him.

I would like to know his thoughts on the Canada Border Services Agency's commitment to hire an additional 1,000 officers, 800 of them armed and 200 unarmed.

Does my colleague agree that we need not 1,000 border officers, but close to 3,000 to meet the needs and provide adequate border security?

[*English*]

Tako Van Popta: Mr. Speaker, my riding is a border riding, or at least it used to be, until the most recent border redistribution. It is very close to the port of Vancouver, so we are deeply concerned about border security not only at land crossings, but also at ocean crossings around the port of Vancouver, which is the biggest port in the country, by the way. Absolutely, we need to improve that.

I know that almost no trains coming across the border are inspected, and not enough cargo ships in harbours are being inspected. Things are being smuggled in and out of the country that should not be. That needs to be improved.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the budget is promising \$13 billion for factory-built homes, which the Prime Minister foreshadowed on April 8, seven months ago, when as the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, he said, “prefabricated and modular housing are the future”. During the election campaign, he told young Canadians to their faces that he would build homes they can afford.

Does the member think factory-built homes will be awarded to a modular company purchased by Brookfield for \$5 billion in 2021? Does he believe the open sentence he gave with the promise to build means the government will build homes young people can afford to rent or buy? Who will have the investment in their homes? Will it be young Canadians or Brookfield and the Prime Minister?

Tako Van Popta: Mr. Speaker, that is a great question. In my speech, I did not have time to get into the housing crisis. I talked about the health crisis, which is a reality, but the housing crisis is definitely a reality as well.

A recent report from the CMHC shows that the Prime Minister's promise of building 500,000 new homes a year is absolutely failing. Not even half of them are being built. Things are heading in the wrong direction. Are modular homes part of the solution? I think they probably are, but they are not the whole solution, of course.

[*Translation*]

Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Langley Township—Fraser Heights. I appreciate that he is sharing his time with me. His French is excellent. I had the opportunity to visit him in his riding, where I received an award from the Fédération des francophones de la Colombie-Britannique. It was a proud moment for me, and my colleague was there.

Today, I rise to speak to Bill C-15, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025 .

The first thing I would like to say is that the current Liberal government, which claims to be new but has actually been in power for 10 years with essentially the same team, revealed a deficit of nearly \$80 billion—\$78 billion to be precise. In addition to this year's \$78-billion deficit, the budget makes no provision for returning to a balanced budget. I get that it is not the same as a Canadian family's budget.

The Liberals came to power in 2015, the year I was elected to represent the beautiful riding of Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, which I will not claim is the most beautiful riding, even though I think it is. The prime minister at that time, Justin Trudeau, said that the government would run a small deficit and then return to a balanced budget. We have accumulated deficits of nearly \$1.4 trillion over the past 10 years. It bears repeating that the total accumulated deficit since the Liberal government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau was first elected has nearly doubled. However, the government likes to claim that this is a wonderful budget.

Here is an example of this Liberal hypocrisy. The Canada summer jobs program supports approximately 100,000 summer jobs. What have we learned about next year's program? To make themselves look good, they are going to increase the number of jobs but reduce the number of weeks. That is the Liberal government. It is not a new Liberal government; it is the Liberal government that has been in power for 10 years.

The Liberals' way of doing things reminds me of what they are doing right now at the Standing Committee on Official Languages. I am privileged to serve the Conservative Party of Canada, the official opposition, as the official languages critic. Over here, we have someone responsible for official languages. Over there, they have a Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture who is responsible for official languages and a number of other things. I will say more about that later. It is not quite the same. During question period today, when the Speaker gave the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture the floor, she did not include the part about him being the minister responsible for official languages. That may be a minor detail, but it is not insignificant.

When it comes to official languages, I would like to remind the House that it was the Liberals who appointed the current Governor General, who does not speak French. I have nothing against the Governor General or her character, but Canada is a bilingual country, English and French. She was appointed by a Liberal government. The Liberals then appointed the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, Canada's only bilingual province, and they chose a unilingual anglophone.

● (1550)

Bill C-13, which sought to modernize the Official Languages Act, received royal assent on June 20, 2023. Today is November 20, 2025. When there is a new act or the modernization of an act, there are regulations to implement that act. Unfortunately, we have been waiting since June 20, 2023, for the regulations to be tabled.

That is textbook Liberal hypocrisy. Liberals boast that they are the protectors of the French language and of both official languages but they do not walk the talk. Let us stop with the razzle-dazzle. That is what they are doing with the budget.

I will continue. As I mentioned earlier, this new Liberal Prime Minister replaced a Liberal prime minister. There was no power disruption. The Liberal Party of Canada is still in power. When the Prime Minister named his first cabinet after being appointed Prime Minister without being elected, he appointed all the ministers in his cabinet, but he forgot to appoint a minister of official languages. The term "minister of official languages" does not seem to be in the current Prime Minister's vocabulary. To correct his mistake, as I mentioned earlier, he appointed a Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture, who is also responsible for official languages, among other things. Should all ministers' titles include a definition of their responsibilities? This shows that the Prime Minister is not serious about official languages.

Following a Radio-Canada article, we spoke up at the Standing Committee on Official Languages to point out that the Prime Minister spoke French only 17% of the time. We requested documents. We asked for his schedule and his training plan. He said he would

Government Orders

improve and that, at the end of his term, he would score a 9 out of 10, as someone who has learned and speaks French.

We recently received the schedule in question from the Prime Minister's Office. We saw that 10 hours of classes were scheduled over a three-month period. Let us just say that this does not show much of an interest in mastering French. I will concede that learning a language is not easy. Still, according to the letter from the Prime Minister's chief of staff, as of September 2, sadly the Prime Minister no longer has a French teacher. I would remind members that today is November 20.

I will come back to the budget because time is short and I wanted to bring up an article that appeared this morning in *Le Journal de Québec*. The headline states that more than one in four Canadians are going into debt to eat.

It is not nasty Conservatives saying it; it is Sylvain Charlebois, who is an expert. We are told to rely on experts and not just our opinions. That is what we are doing. The members opposite are fixated on one idea: that everyone is against them, everyone is wrong and they are right. However, more than a quarter of Canadians are going into debt to eat.

Last week, we were in our ridings. I visited 17 organizations in my riding, including the *Mouvement d'entraide des Cantons-Unis* in Stoneham-et-Tewkesbury, S.O.S Accueil in Saint-Raymond and several St. Vincent de Paul locations.

They all told me that demand has gone up. This budget does not actually do anything for Canadians. People are now struggling to put food on the table. We need to act responsibly. We moved an amendment to stop Liberal waste and to give Canadians some breathing room to live. When I am asked questions later, I will have more information to share.

* * *

● (1555)

[*English*]

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUILDING CANADA ACT

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, pursuant to subsection 24(1) of the Building Canada Act and section 62 of the Emergencies Act, a special joint committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to review the Governor in Council's and the Minister's exercise of their powers and performance of their duties and functions under the Building Canada Act, and to report to each House of Parliament the results of its review, at least once every 180 days while Parliament is neither prorogued or dissolved provided that:

Government Orders

- (a) the committee be composed of five members of the Senate and 11 members of the House of Commons, including five members of the House of Commons from the government party, five members of the House of Commons from the Official Opposition and one member of the House of Commons from the Bloc Québécois;
- (b) the joint chair of the committee on the part of the Senate shall be as determined by the Senate and the joint chair of the committee on the part of the House of Commons shall be a member representing the Official Opposition;
- (c) in addition to the joint chairs, the committee shall elect two vice-chairs from the House of Commons, of whom the first vice-chair shall be a member representing the government party and the second vice-chair shall be the member representing the Bloc Québécois;
- (d) the House of Commons members be named by their respective whips by depositing with the Clerk of the House the lists of their members to serve on the committee within one calendar week of the adoption of this motion;
- (e) the quorum of the committee be nine members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses, including one member of the government party in the House of Commons and one from the opposition in the House of Commons, are represented, and that the joint chairs be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever five members are present, so long as both Houses, including one member of the government party in the House of Commons and one member from the opposition in the House of Commons, are represented;
- (f) changes to the membership of the committee, on the part of the House of Commons, be effective immediately after notification by the relevant whip has been filed with the Clerk of the House;
- (g) membership substitutions, on the part of the House of Commons, be permitted, if required, in the manner provided for in Standing Order 114(2);
- (h) the committee have the power to:
- (i) sit during sittings and adjournments of the House,
 - (ii) report from time to time,
 - (iii) send for persons, papers and records,
 - (iv) print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee,
 - (v) retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff, including legal counsel,
 - (vi) appoint, from among its members such subcommittees as may be deemed appropriate and to delegate to such subcommittees, all or any of its powers, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons,
 - (vii) authorize video and audio broadcasting of any or all of its public proceedings and that they be made available to the public via the Parliament of Canada's websites;
- (i) all documents laid before the House pursuant to the Act shall be referred to the committee, and any such documents tabled prior to the adoption of this order shall, instead, be deemed referred to the committee;
- (j) that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

● (1600)

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. parliamentary secretary's moving the motion will please say nay.

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[Translation]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Par-

liament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking the time to explain his vision. Bill C-15 includes legislation on the high-speed rail network to govern the high-speed rail project. We are in favour of this project.

However, I would like to remind the House that in the Gaspé there is a rail line being refurbished from Matapédia to Port-Daniel-Gascons and that Via Rail, which is funded by taxpayers in Quebec and Canada, refuses to resume service and provide Gaspé residents with what they deserve and what they are paying for through their taxes. Via Rail is refusing to fulfill its duty of providing regional connections.

Does my colleague agree that we should call on Via Rail to finally do what it is paid to do?

Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that the Liberals do not see because they are out of touch. Can we focus on what is happening here in people's daily lives, including in the Gaspé, as my colleague mentioned? Can we deal with this quasi-essential service instead of going around the world looking for investments? Investments are fine, but we also need to take care of our constituents so that they can work, travel, and put food on the table. I completely agree with my colleague.

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the way talks about hypocrisy, but I want to talk about competence.

Let us compare two anonymous applicants. Who would we trust to manage a complex financial and economic crisis? Would we trust a former central banker who graduated from Oxford University, who helped manage both the 2008 financial crisis and Brexit, or a lifelong politician who has never worked a single day in the private sector?

Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alfred-Pellan, but I obviously do not share his opinion.

Personally, I would rather do business with someone who is capable of managing a personal budget, a family budget, than with someone who is selling Canada to the global elite. I am concerned that the Prime Minister and the Liberals are selling out Canada. Meanwhile, average Canadians are suffering.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. He and I have both been members of the Standing Committee on Official Languages for quite some time.

In British Columbia, where I live, the cost of living is very high. I want to ask him if he can talk about the impact of inflation in his riding and how the deficit is affecting inflation.

Government Orders

• (1605)

Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of sitting on the Standing Committee on Official Languages with my colleague from Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge.

It is indeed a reality that people are suffering. People are suffering in our communities.

As I mentioned in my speech, I made a few donations. As everyone knows, MPs have a small budget for sponsorships. Last week, I walked around with my sign and helped 17 charities. I gave them a little money so that they can give out more Christmas hampers this year. It is bad.

Meanwhile, my Liberal colleague from Spadina—Harbourfront is talking about lifelines. Canada is not a developing country. Should we be proud? Can we respect the people of our country, Canada, Canadians? It is the least we can do. The Liberals should go out into the streets to see what the everyday reality of Canadians looks like.

[*English*]

Hon. Randeep Sarai (Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Honoré-Mercier.

I appreciate the opportunity to rise to speak about this essential piece of legislation that would advance our government's plan to build Canada strong.

We are living through a moment of profound global change. The systems that have long underpinned our prosperity are being challenged, and Canadians are feeling the effects of those pressures on their everyday lives. Responding to those challenges requires meeting the moment with clarity and purpose, and budget 2025 is our plan to transform our economy to one that is stronger, more self-sufficient and more resilient to global shocks. Our plan would build on Canada's strengths, world-class industries, skilled and talented workers, diverse trade partnerships and a strong domestic market where we can be our own best customers.

Canada's new government is delivering an investment budget. We would spend less on government operations to invest more in workers, businesses and nation-building infrastructure that will grow our economy for the long term. At this time of intense global pressures, responsible leadership means focusing on what we can control, and budget 2025 reflects that reality.

Every department has had to make disciplined and sometimes difficult decisions so that we can keep our investments targeted, effective and sustainable. In my portfolio, this means focusing resources where Canada's impact is greatest: modernizing our tool kit, deploying Canadian expertise and working through new partnerships and innovative approaches to maximize the impact of public dollars and deliver meaningful assistance to vulnerable communities around the world. Across government, the resources identified through budget 2025 are critical to the generational investments in housing, infrastructure, defence, productivity and competitiveness that Canada needs to safeguard its future in a rapidly changing world. These would enable \$1 trillion in total investments over the next five years through our focused public spending and stronger capital investment.

We are creating an economy by Canadians for Canadians and the budget implementation act is a key part of this work. From building more homes and expanding clean electricity to upgrading the infrastructure that growing communities rely on every day, this budget would deliver investments that will shape Canada's future for decades to come. For instance, the new building communities fund would support provinces, territories and municipalities as they strengthen the roads, water systems, transit and health facilities that underpin a strong economy. A dedicated \$5-billion health infrastructure fund would help ensure hospitals, emergency rooms, urgent care centres and medical schools in communities like mine and across the country have the health infrastructure required to meet the needs of Canadians. I encourage provinces and territories to seize these opportunities to invest in the infrastructure essential to building the strong foundation our economy needs.

However, building a strong foundation for our economy also requires a tax system that rewards investment, accelerates innovation and strengthens Canada's competitiveness. That is why the budget implementation act advances a focused tax strategy to supercharge productivity and attract new capital. It would introduce a productivity superdeduction, enhancing incentives that would allow businesses to immediately write off a larger share of new capital investments, helping them invest and grow. This would include the reinstated accelerated investment incentive and a 100% first-year write-off for investments in manufacturing and processing equipment, clean energy technologies, zero-emission vehicles, productivity-enhancing assets, and scientific research and experimental development.

Our government knows that innovation and scientific discovery are the foundation of long-term economic growth. Science fuels innovation and innovation fuels productivity, helping Canada stay competitive in a fast-changing global economy. That is why we would also strengthen the scientific research and experimental development tax incentive program by increasing expenditure limits, restoring the eligibility of SR and ED capital expenditures and expanding eligibility to more Canadian firms. All told, these additional government investments of \$440 million on an ongoing basis are expected to generate near \$1.2 billion in economic output each year, about a three-time return for Canada's economy.

Government Orders

• (1610)

To provide certainty for business investment decisions, we are also proposing enhancements to existing investment tax credits to expand eligibility and extend the availability of select tax credits. This includes improving our suite of clean economy investment tax credits and expanding eligibility of the critical mineral exploration tax credit to include an additional 12 essential minerals.

In addition to ensuring that Canada has the right incentives to attract investment and grow our economy, we need to ensure that we are not putting ourselves at a disadvantage. The budget implementation act also proposes to eliminate or modify tax measures that have proven to be inefficient, costly to administer and challenging for Canadian industries at a time of ongoing global economic uncertainty.

To provide relief to the aviation and boating industries and to streamline the luxury tax framework, we are moving forward with ending the luxury tax on aircraft and vessels as of the day after budget day. To simplify Canada's tax system and reduce compliance costs for taxpayers and governments, and in light of existing measures like the federal foreign buyer ban and municipal and provincial vacant home taxes, we are moving forward with eliminating the underused housing tax as of the 2025 calendar year.

The legislation being debated today is full of measures to drive growth, support workers and build a more resilient Canadian economy. It also includes measures that could help build more affordable homes, fight financial fraud and put more money in the pockets of Canadians. We are able to do all this by spending less on operations so that we can invest more in Canada, enabling the government to direct federal spending forward, enhancing productivity and strengthening capital formation, as reflected in many of the measures I have highlighted today.

The budget positions our country for the long term. It invests in the homes, infrastructure and opportunities Canadians need, and it ensures that Canada remains a steady, reliable partner in an uncertain world. As we build a stronger and more resilient Canada, we will continue to stand for humanitarian leadership, for meaningful international partnerships and for a Canada that is secure at home and respected abroad.

This legislation turns the ambitions of budget 2025 into concrete action, and I urge all members to support it so that Canadians can begin to reap the benefits of building Canada strong.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has spent more than any other in Canadian history, and it is promising to spend even more. How can the hon. member opposite justify a budget that pours gasoline on the inflationary fires that families are dealing with, with more Canadians lining up at food banks?

• (1615)

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to go to the World Bank meetings in Washington recently. If we compare Canada to the rest of the world, whether it is our G7 partners, the OECD or other like-minded countries, there is no country with a better financial track record than Canada's. We are one of only two countries in the world that have a AAA credit history with Moody's and S&P Global. We were mentioned by the IMF, which said we

had the best framework, along with Germany. If we look at inflationary pressures, we were also one of the best countries at reducing inflationary pressures after the Ukraine war and the COVID-19 pandemic began.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is a climate capitulation budget. It cuts Environment Canada's budget by 15%, ends the electric vehicle incentive program for light-, medium- and heavy-duty vehicles and eliminates green renovation programs.

However, something else is very much a part of this budget. Subsidies for oil and gas companies are being increased and extended. Can my hon. colleague tell me how many more billions of dollars are being made available to oil and gas companies in the form of tax credits for the carbon capture and sequestration program? Is it \$3 billion, \$6 billion or \$10 billion? I want to know.

[*English*]

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, we are investing heavily in clean hydro and electricity. We are investing heavily in critical minerals, which are the lifeline of batteries and EVs and the future of this country and the planet. These are the types of lifetime investments we are doing to enable Canada not only to be a leader in our legislation to curb emissions, control emissions and bring us to a net-zero climate, but also to bring the ingredients, manufacturing capacity and industrial capacity to lead that charge and be the fastest-growing economy in the G7.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has often made reference to what our caucus talks a great deal about: how we are going to move forward to build Canada strong. We talk about building the strongest economy in the G7. That is important to all members of the Liberal caucus, and it is being spearheaded by the Prime Minister. It is one of the reasons he is aggressively pursuing trade that goes beyond Canada-U.S. borders, hoping to double our exports in the next 10 years.

Can the member provide his thoughts on how important it is that we continue to build a stronger and healthier Canada?

Government Orders

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, for far too long, we have been reliant almost exclusively on one market, which is the United States. It has been a wake-up call. However, Canada has been very fortunate. In the last 10 years, we have done numerous trade deals, like the CPTPP, CETA with Europe, and those with several South American countries. We are the only G7 country with a free trade deal with every G7 country.

In my role as Secretary of State for International Development, I get to go to many countries that are in the beginning steps of reaching free trade agreements or have just reached them. The opportunities are endless. I think Canada has to explore them, and Prime Minister Carney is leading a team and leading—

The Deputy Speaker: I will just interrupt the secretary of state. The member cannot use the name of the Prime Minister in the House.

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is leading the charge with cabinet ministers and taking a team Canada approach with all these countries to expand our trade opportunities. This is to make the products that Canada needs to give to the rest of the world, and those that Canada needs to ensure we have sufficient, safe and reliable supply chains and have the ingredients to help build an affordable and industrious Canada.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, can the member tell me how much Canadian investment the Prime Minister promised will cross over into the U.S. over the next five years?

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, almost \$2 billion a day goes back and forth between the U.S. and Canada. It is a robust economic agreement we have. Our goal is to take it beyond that and double our international trade so we are less reliant on the U.S. That will be our focus for the future.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a huge honour to rise today to discuss budget 2025, which was passed on Monday and Tuesday by a majority of members in the House. It is a budget that will profoundly shape the country we are building for our kids and grandkids.

It offers a practical plan for a better future, a healthy, prosperous and strong future, where we are masters of our own destiny in an uncertain and evolving world.

We cannot control what happens in the rest of the world. However, we can control how we prepare our country for the future: the strength of our economy, the safety of our communities, the resilience of our infrastructure and the ability of our families to prosper. Budget 2025 does just that.

I would like to begin by discussing what I consider the essence of my involvement in politics, which I believe holds true for all members of the House: Canadians, the families in my riding of Honoré-Mercier, young people, workers, parents, and seniors in Anjou, Rivière-des-Prairies and across the country.

I would like to highlight some concrete initiatives, such as L'Artère de l'Est, a new transitional housing service for vulnerable

youth in Montreal East, which I had the pleasure of visiting last week in Pointe-de-l'Île for the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure. This project was made possible in part because of a federal investment of \$1.3 million. It offers young people 16 to 23 a safe place, personalized support and practical tools to regain stability, independence, and above all, hope.

I am also thinking of the sports and aquatic centre in Montreal North, in Bourassa, a facility that will directly benefit families in the area. This centre will provide a place where residents and our young people can challenge themselves, get in shape, discover their passions, feel safe, and forge strong bonds. This centre will definitely be used by people in Rivière-des-Prairies and Anjou. This is exactly the type of project that federal investments, like the ones in budget 2025, make possible. These facilities will improve daily life, create a sense of belonging, and strengthen social cohesion.

I am saying this as a member of Parliament, but also as a father of two young daughters. When we talk about the future, it is critical that we talk specifically about our young people and the opportunities they should be able to have. This year alone, in Honoré-Mercier, the Canada summer jobs program created 177 jobs. More than \$800,000 was invested in the communities of Anjou and Rivière-des-Prairies. In addition, 31 local organizations received support, including Équipe RDP, CHORRA, Camp YOPI and the organization Association québécoise de la défense des droits des personnes retraitées et préretraitées, among many others.

When we talk about the future, we also need to talk about the Canadians who built this country, who passed on our values, and who continue to uphold the spirit of citizenship. I am talking about our seniors. Budget 2025 recognizes them and has committed the necessary resources and investments to support them. One concrete example is the New Horizons for Seniors program. With annual funding of \$60 million, the program supports projects that reduce isolation, strengthen social participation and protect the dignity of seniors.

In Honoré-Mercier, I have had the opportunity to support a number of groups that work every day with seniors to keep them active, including the group Aîné-es J'écoute en actions in Rivière-des-Prairies and the group Cercle des fermières Anjou.

For this progress to last, we need a strong economy that can create lasting prosperity in a world marked by uncertainty. With this budget, Canada is on track to attract nearly \$500 billion in responsible investment over the next five years. These investments will create good jobs, make us more competitive and ensure sustainable growth. Budget 2025 allows us to take control of our economy, our sovereignty and our future, and to become our own best customer here at home.

Government Orders

However, building a modern economy also requires bold action on another fundamental pillar: climate action. Budget 2025 makes it clear that economic prosperity and climate action go hand in hand. Not only are they not mutually exclusive, but they also reinforce each other.

• (1625)

Our long-term economic health depends on the health of our environment. Our jobs depend on the quality of our resources. Our security depends on climate stability. Our well-being depends on nature, air, water, forests and ecosystems. That is why the 2025 budget places a strong emphasis on climate transition, while supporting economic growth.

As announced by Minister Dabrusin at COP30, Canada wants to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 45% to 50% by 2035. This is not just an environmental target, it is a plan for economic and ecological resilience. The goal is to attract more clean investment, to become a competitive country in a global economy where green innovation is becoming indispensable and to protect the health, safety and well-being of our communities. Budget 2025 gives us the tools to achieve this goal by strengthening industrial carbon pricing, a powerful driver of greenhouse gas emissions reductions and investment in clean innovation. It is a win for competitiveness, a win for the economy, a win for the climate and a win for Canada.

Budget 2025 also strengthens other important tools: tougher methane emissions regulations, a clear taxonomy for sustainable investments, a modernized sustainable bond framework and climate disclosure rules to help businesses plan, innovate and grow. These actions will result in meaningful movement toward Canada's climate goals while driving innovation, investment and job creation.

Supporting this transition and supporting our growth also requires robust infrastructure. That is why budget 2025 would invest \$280 billion over five years to build modern, sustainable, safe and resilient infrastructure. These investments include \$51 billion specifically for community infrastructure. This means safer roads, modernized bridges and more efficient and climate-resilient buildings.

Montreal is home to one of the flagship projects: the metro's blue line extension, which includes a station in Anjou. This project will improve mobility, make the east end of Montreal more attractive, reduce commuting time and contribute to a better quality of life for thousands of families.

I hope to eventually improve transportation in the east, especially for people in Rivière-des-Prairies. Last week, young people in my riding told us that it takes about an hour and a half to get from Rivière-des-Prairies to the Université du Québec à Montréal, McGill University or Concordia University. We are going to keep fighting to improve transportation in Rivière-des-Prairies and in Anjou.

A budget that builds for the future also has to address the immediate needs of Canadians. Budget 2025 proposes several critical measures to make life more affordable. It starts with something simple, something fundamental, like automatic access to benefits for millions of Canadians. Automatic tax filing for low-income families will give hundreds of thousands of people automatic ac-

cess to the credits and benefits they are entitled to receive. Though humble in appearance, it has a mighty impact.

Speaking of impact, let us turn the discussion back to our kids. The national school food program now receives permanent annual funding of \$216 million. No, this program is not garbage. A child who gets better nutrition is able to learn better. A child who learns better is more likely to succeed. This program is an investment in the human future of the country.

Since we are talking about human dignity, let us also talk about health. The Canadian dental care plan, which was strengthened by the budget, now covers more than five million Canadians, including 23,000 residents of Honoré-Mercier, representing nearly one-quarter of the population of my riding. That is why budget 2025 invests heavily in the future, including in the RCMP. These resources will help keep our neighbourhoods safe, whether in Anjou, Rivière-des-Prairies or elsewhere in the country.

Budget 2025 is a generational budget. It is modern, grounded in reality and, above all, compassionate. It will enable Canada to take control of our economy, our sovereignty and our future. We will have a Canada that is ready to face an unstable and rapidly changing world, as well as a fairer, more prosperous Canada.

• (1630)

The Deputy Speaker: I must remind the hon. member that members are not to use ministers' names. He was talking about the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech and congratulate him on his election. I know it has been a long time, but I still want to congratulate him on his first term in the House.

My question is very simple. We know that his government likes to talk about a generational budget. We keep hearing that it is generational, that it is going to be talked about for generations, that it is going to impact generations. Can you tell us how many generations of children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren will have to pay for the \$78.3-billion deficit?

The Deputy Speaker: The member used the word “you”. The Chair will not answer the question, but I invite the hon. member for Honoré-Mercier to respond.

The hon. member for Honoré-Mercier.

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for asking such an excellent question during our first exchange in the House. I thank him for the outstanding work he does in his riding.

To answer my colleague's question, our budget includes operating costs and investments. We are making significant investments in projects. We talked a little earlier about transformative projects like the Alto project. Last week, there was also an announcement about the Crawford mine in Timmins, in northern Ontario.

The idea really is to invest and think about our children's future. I have two young daughters, aged six and 10. We really need to think about their future.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Honoré-Mercier really surprises me.

He formed an environment and climate change committee within the government out of concern that the government is completely giving up on the fight against climate change. Today, he shows up in the House and delivers a speech that is literally greenwashing, where he brags about a budget that has been so harshly criticized that Canada won a fossil award, an international booby prize.

That budget cuts Environment and Climate Change Canada's spending, abandons important measures, gives billions of dollars to oil companies and abandons the emissions cap for the oil and gas sector. I would like my hon. colleague to explain to me how he can support and praise a budget that surrenders to climate change, that is criticized by NGOs, that is criticized internationally, and that gives money to oil and gas companies. It is shameful.

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Repentigny for his question and his commitment, but I must correct some of his comments. He mentioned an environmental committee. I think my colleague is referring to the caucus within the Liberal Party. All parties have caucuses, and this caucus was created to fuel discussion. It gives us an opportunity to discuss climate change.

My colleague's remarks are not accurate. As I mentioned in my speech, our government is working on measures that my colleague supported. These include taxonomy and methane regulations, which is truly one of the most effective ways to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

Then there is industrial carbon pricing, another measure that my colleague also supported. We know that this measure is very effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

[*English*]

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, could the member elaborate on how measures such as industrial carbon pricing, methane regulations and investments in clean energy are benefiting Canadians in Honoré-Mercier and all across the country?

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Speaker, we know that there was some support in the budget for the youth climate corps, support that will help youth advance work on important issues in protecting the environment.

As I mentioned, there is also a sustainable bond framework, which is helping to advance green bonds. There is also advancement on climate disclosure. There are a lot of measures that are going to benefit the folks in my riding.

Last week in Montreal, there was an announcement of the REM extension, increasing public transportation and some further work. As I mentioned, there is \$51 billion being invested in infrastructure

Government Orders

projects across the country. We are very happy and excited to continue this great work.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, thank you for calling me to order. It appears that I addressed another member using the informal form “tu”. I am quite embarrassed and must apologize. I have been an elected official for 17 years and yet I made this mistake. Even in my private life I tend to address everyone with the formal “vous”. Well, it happens to everyone.

It is Thursday evening. It has been a good day, and I am in a good mood, so I want to start this speech, my response to the budget speech, on the right foot. There is one thing in this budget that makes me very happy, and that is page 82.

On page 82 of the budget, there is a box, a separate bit of text, that very clearly defines the political philosophy that inspires me here in the House. It addresses the idea of “one project, one review”, meaning one environmental review.

My colleagues will recall that, a little over two years ago, I introduced Bill C-375 in the House. After eight years in the House of Commons, this was the first time I had the opportunity to introduce a private member's bill that would be debated in the House. There is a lottery, and those who win get to introduce a bill.

Before I go any further, I wish to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Regina—Wascana.

About two years ago, I introduced Bill C-375, which aimed to do exactly what is found word for word in the budget speech on page 82, specifically, “one project, one review”.

The purpose of that bill was to speed up the process and make it much more efficient and pragmatic so that projects could get done. Now more than ever, we need to unlock our full potential in terms of energy, natural resources and green projects. We know that in the past, a project had to undergo a provincial assessment and then a federal assessment. Sometimes, these assessments contradicted each other and, ultimately, everything had to start over from scratch. It was completely inefficient.

The purpose of Bill C-375 was to move projects forward in a positive and constructive manner. The goal was not to take away accountability, but rather to eliminate the consecutive and often conflicting assessments. The objective was to work together to cover all the environmental aspects of a project by requiring one assessment, not two, to get to the bottom of the matter immediately.

I am very pleased that the government has adopted my proposal. However, I would like to point out that the bill was introduced on February 12, 2024. There was a debate in the House on March 18 of that year and a vote on May 8 of the same year.

Government Orders

What happened? Obviously, we Conservatives voted in favour. Since the bill was at second reading stage and the vote was on the principle of the bill, the Bloc Québécois members at the time supported the essence or spirit of Bill C-375. They had some reservations, of course. That is perfectly fine. That is how democracy works. There were 150 votes in favour of the bill, but unfortunately, this bill to create a single environmental assessment was defeated by 177 votes from the NDP and the Liberal government.

I see members opposite who remember that situation. At the time, they insulted us for wanting to axe the carbon tax. In the end, they axed it themselves. They were against the “one project, one review” principle back then, but now it is reproduced word for word on page 82 of the budget. I just wanted to point that out.

That is one of the only things in this budget that I see as positive. The government keeps referring to this budget as “generational”, saying that it is truly a turning point in the history of the country and that generations of Canadians will be able to benefit from it.

Well, it is not. Generations of Canadians will pay the price because we are living beyond our means. We are living on credit. It is a credit card budget.

There will be a \$78.3-billion deficit. That is twice as much as Prime Minister Trudeau's deficit. The man had many fine qualities—really, I mean that sincerely—but there is no denying that he was spendthrift.

No one could have ever believed that a Prime Minister with such international prestige, a banker who is highly regarded around the world, would do worse than Mr. Trudeau, but that is what happened.

I would like to remind members that the Liberals were elected on a promise to run a deficit \$19 billion lower than what they are now saying. Members should also recall that the deficit is twice as high now as it was last year at around the same time.

● (1640)

What is even more shocking about this budget is that there is no timeline for getting spending under control and balancing the budget. There is no timeline at all. On the contrary, deficits will pile up: \$78.3 billion this year, \$65.4 billion next year, \$63.5 billion the year after that, \$57.9 billion the year after that, and finally \$56.6 billion. There is no plan to get back on track, and \$321 billion is being added to the debt. Again, what this current Prime Minister is doing is twice as much as Mr. Trudeau planned to do. These people did not get elected by saying that they would do twice as badly as Justin Trudeau, yet that is exactly what they have done.

It is our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren who will have to pay for this. I am blessed by the gods and very privileged in life. I am a father, and for the past five years, I have been a grandfather. That is why, even though I cannot show it, I am wearing a little bracelet made by my three-year-old granddaughter. I try to wear it as often as possible in the House because I have always believed that we are here thanks to our parents, but that we are here for our children and grandchildren. This belief has been a driving force for me throughout my 17 years in politics. More than ever, that is how I see it and that is what I want.

Debt is a bill that we pass on to our children. Debt has to be paid off at some point. Interest on debt has to be paid every year. That interest amounts to \$55.6 billion that we are going to pay. The people watching at home need to know that every dollar and cent of the GST we pay is not used to improve services or make transfers to the provinces to improve health care services or other things. It is used solely and exclusively to pay the interest on the debt. Every penny of the GST will be used for that instead of investing more in health care. The government is investing \$54.7 billion in health care, while GST revenues total \$54.4 billion. That is why it is imperative for the government to get the finances under control, to get the deficit and debt reduction under control and, above all, to have a timeline for returning to a balanced budget.

Allow me to remind the House that, yes, a balanced budget is possible. Here in the House, we have an experienced man who was once elected to the National Assembly and who now serves all of Canada as a member of the House of Commons. On March 11, 2015, he said, “Balancing the budget...is a way to cement the credibility of the province and the financial stability of the province.” Who said that? It was the current Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry. I had the pleasure of serving alongside him in the National Assembly in another life. The current parliamentary secretary to the current government's Minister of Industry balanced Quebec's budget. That means that yes, it can be done. As a Quebecer, I am very pleased to have had that man around at the precise moment when he was the finance minister because, thanks to him and the government he belonged to, including the member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, Quebec was able to balance its budget. Where there is a will, there is a way.

Unfortunately, this man who sits here in the House could serve Canada much better if he were in cabinet. Since he is not, could the Prime Minister at least consult him on how to tackle the deficit issues? This is a very heavy burden that will have far-reaching consequences for the future of our children and our great-grandchildren.

[English]

I just want to say in the House of Commons that, in my mind, this budget is good for one aspect, one project, one evaluation. We have that definition on page 96 of this budget. This is very interesting. This is exactly what we proposed two years ago here in the House, but unfortunately, the Liberals voted against it at that time. Today, they are doing what we were asking them to do two years ago.

● (1645)

The Deputy Speaker: 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 Saanich—Gulf Islands, Foreign Affairs; the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Employment; the hon. member for Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, Carbon Pricing.

I recognize the member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas.

Government Orders

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard the member opposite speak a few times. He is an excellent speaker, and I think he would make an excellent leader of the opposition.

The member opposite has spoken about streamlining evaluation across jurisdictions. I think that is a very important point. He was at a Green Building event recently, speaking very highly of and advocating for green building standards. Of course, the Canadian debt is a concern, so I thank him for highlighting that.

I was wondering if the member opposite could also acknowledge that, in the current geopolitical context with the United States and shifting trade alliances, we are in a different reality now, and this budget addresses some of those realities.

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, obviously the world has changed. I remember pretty well the Prime Minister, while he was campaigning, saying, “Elbows up”. What happened? He went to the White House twice, and was it elbows up? No, it was thumbs up. The reality today is empty hands. He went from elbows up to thumbs up to empty hands. That is not the way to address the reality of the geopolitical situation right now.

Talking about the Leader of the Opposition, he was so efficient and so good that he convinced the Liberal Party to kick out Justin Trudeau and to cut the carbon tax. This is a leader who is very efficient. I can assure the member of that.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am torn. Yes, we need to have control over public finances, but we also need to consider the social aspect. I started my week by attending a press conference to announce a food drive being organized by SOS Dépannage in Granby. I found out that more and more seniors are requesting food hampers.

My colleague used to be a journalist. I would like to hear his comments on the critical issue of helping regional media survive. I know he is aware of this issue. I studied journalism, so I understand the link and how important it is, in a democracy, to have local media in the regions. What are the consequences of investing in only one media outlet, namely Radio-Canada, and completely failing to support other media outlets, whether private or community-based? This is particularly important given the advertising crisis we are currently experiencing. This has direct consequences for democracy in our regions.

What does my colleague, a former journalist, think about that?

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question and congratulate her on her work. Yes, I am a former journalist, so I can truly appreciate what is going on, but I recognize that everything also happens on social media now and that the media has to adapt. There used to be a local newspaper in my riding, but it has now become much more of a virtual newspaper that is much more in tune with everyday reality, which is evolving very quickly.

We also need to recognize that the Liberal Party's commitment to give the Crown corporation alone another \$150 million is not the best approach. Our approach was completely different, of course. The Liberals won, and that is fine, but I sincerely encourage them

to reconsider the \$150 million they are offering to CBC/Radio-Canada.

[*English*]

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this budget means that Canadians will pay more in interest on the national debt than the federal government will transfer for health care and than the government collects in GST. It is as though every dollar collected from GST revenue will go to interest payments, not to doctors and nurses.

How do you think Canadians feel about the government prioritizing debt payments—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member. The member referred to hon. member directly. The member has speak through the Chair to the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

I will let the member finish her question, and I will then let the member respond.

• (1650)

Connie Cody: Mr. Speaker, what does the member feel that Canadians feel about the government prioritizing debt payments to make bankers and bondholders rich instead of addressing the crisis in our health care system?

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her hard work in the House and in her riding. By the way, she is among the few people who unseated a Liberal MP. I am very proud of that.

The question raised by the member is very important because we are talking about where the priority of the government is. Does it want to put more money in the banking system or in directly helping Canadians? This is why we will fight. Our job is to fight through some difficulties that we will address, but in this situation, what we see is the government putting too much money in the deficit, and they live over the—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Regina—Wascana.

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to rise today, but before I get too far into the details of the budget implementation act, I would be remiss if I did not provide the House with at least a bit of an update on the Saskatchewan Roughriders Grey Cup celebrations, which have been going on all week in Regina and right across Saskatchewan.

Fans of the green and white poured into the streets on Sunday evening to celebrate the 25-17 Grey Cup victory over the Montreal Alouettes. I am sure that, from now until Christmas, Grey Cup champion merchandise will be flying off the shelves at the Rider team store.

Government Orders

As exciting as Grey Cup Sunday is, it is important to remember that a Grey Cup championship does not just happen by luck on one day of the year. It is the result of hard work and tough decisions that began weeks or months, and sometimes years, in advance. Every time a football team starts with a good field position, makes a consistent drive down the field and then finishes the drive with a touchdown, that success was the result of strong leadership, which includes recruiting the right players and coaches and coming up with the right playbook.

On the other hand, when a team has poor leadership for many years, eventually that poor leadership manifests itself on the field in the form of costly penalties and giving up quarterback sacks. That is exactly what the budget feels like to me. There are too many penalties, a bad field position and a lot of talk about future touchdowns that never seem to happen on the field.

Let us take a closer look at what is in the budget. It shows a deficit of \$78 billion this year, a record outside the pandemic. The total accumulated debt is \$1.3 trillion, which is also a record, and interest payments on the debt have skyrocketed to \$56 billion a year. That is also a record, and \$56 billion per year in interest payments is such a huge number that it is difficult for people to visualize just how much money that is.

Let us take a look at how much money that is on a per household basis. When we divide \$56 billion by the number of households in Canada, we get about \$3,400 per household per year. That is the amount of money that leaves Canadian households, not because of anything they did wrong and not because of anything they purchased but because the federal government spends more money than it has.

What could a Canadian family do with that \$3,400 per year? That is where the reality of this burden becomes clear. For some families, \$3,400 is a month's mortgage payment. For others, it is groceries for two months. For others, it is a used vehicle for their teenage son or daughter who needs to get to work. For a family with kids, it could be an entire year of RESP contributions.

In football terms, this is like starting every offensive drive with a quarterback sack. Before the quarterback even has a chance to call a play, and before a Canadian family can plan their household budget, they are getting team tackled by the record-high cost of the government's debt servicing.

As football fans in the rest of Canada watched the Roughriders win the Grey Cup last Sunday, many of them probably said to themselves that there is always next year, that maybe their team will have better luck next season. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for interest payments on the federal debt. That is because, according to the government's own numbers, interest payments next year are expected to be higher than they were this year. Interest payments the following year are expected to be higher still. In fact, interest payments on the debt are projected to break a new record every year for the rest of the decade, according to the budget.

• (1655)

In football terms, if a quarterback was tackled by a 300-pound defensive lineman this season, they can expect to be tackled by a 400-pound defensive lineman next season. The following season,

they will have a 500-pound defensive lineman tackling them. That is what these interest payments on the debt are doing to Canadians.

Canadian families are doing their part. They are budgeting, they are cutting back and they are sacrificing. Many of them are turning to food banks. However, the Liberal government, with the team's coaching staff and general manager, keeps calling plays that make life harder. For 10 years now, under two Liberal prime ministers and four Liberal finance ministers, we have seen the same pattern: more spending, more borrowing, more debt and more interest payments.

While the Prime Minister likes to say that the Liberals are "spending less to invest more", the reality is they are spending more, lots more. According to the budget's own numbers, the government is projected to spend more money every year for the rest of the decade. Sadly, in many cases, when the Liberal government chooses to spend, it is often not for valid fiscal reasons, but for ideological ones.

For example, the budget highlights the importance of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council because of its "important role in advancing the government's growth agenda by advancing research and attracting top international research talent", but the budget document provides very little detail about what types of projects the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council is going to fund. Let us take a look at some of the projects it has funded recently.

It spent \$20,000 to study the gender politics of Peruvian rock music. I do not know why we needed to spend \$20,000 on that, but the Liberals seemed to think we did. The Liberals funded another study about online selfies, including fat fashion photography on Instagram, social justice selfies and selfies that violate social norms. That one cost us \$94,000. They also felt the need to come up with a gender-inclusive and intersectional piano curriculum. That was to the tune of \$17,000. Pardon the pun. There was one study that focused on grocery carts, but sadly, it did not have anything to do with the rising cost of groceries that people put into carts, only people's feelings about the grocery carts themselves. In any case, that study has cost Canadian taxpayers over \$100,000 to date.

Canadians deserve better from their government. There were some very practical solutions to the rising cost of living that Conservatives suggested be put into the budget, such as cancelling the industrial carbon tax, the federal fuel standard and regulations on plastic food packaging, all of which drive up the cost of groceries and the cost of living. Unfortunately, the Liberals refused.

Government Orders

I have no doubt that the Liberals will say that I am being negative, but I am not. I am just being honest. There is no message more positive and hopeful than this: Canada can do better than what we have seen from the Liberals over the last 10 years. Canadians should be able to move out of their parents' basements and put roofs over their heads. They should be able to feed their families without resorting to food banks, and they should be able to have a comfortable future without drowning in more and more debt every year.

If the government wants to learn from the Grey Cup champions, here is a quick film review: end inflationary deficits, restore fiscal discipline and deliver immediate relief on the things Canadians buy every week. That is the way to turn a cellar-dweller into a champion.

• (1700)

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for expressing himself on the budget, but I suggest he may want to stick to football as opposed to the economy as a topic.

As it relates to the economy, let us talk a little about the future. I have been wrestling with all these Conservative comments. A portion of the budget is expenses and a portion is investment, and the biggest portion of the budget is investment. How does investment tie into inflation? That is what I would like the member to explain to me.

Michael Kram: Mr. Speaker, what I have found so troubling about the Liberals over the years is they constantly want to play a shell game when it comes to the budget. It used to be that they were going to balance the budget come hell or high water, when Paul Martin was prime minister, and then they changed their tune to say that it was not going to be balanced but was going to be a portion of the debt-to-GDP ratio. Now they are saying they are going to balance the operating budget but will keep spending and spending on interest payments on the debt and on infrastructure investments. It is important to understand that money is money and spending is spending, and Canadians will have to pay it back with interest, which is something the Liberals either do not understand or do not seem to care about.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague's speech.

The Bloc Québécois shares some of his views, including on the fact that the deficit is very high and that public funds must be used wisely.

One of the expenditures in this budget is subsidies for the oil industry. Roughly \$9 billion a year is given to the oil industry. It seems to me that if there is one sector of the economy that should be able to function without subsidies, it is the oil industry.

How can my colleague reconcile his desire for a well-managed budget with subsidies for the oil industry?

[*English*]

Michael Kram: Mr. Speaker, the benefits to society from our natural resource sector far outweigh the costs. I would like to point out that the Government of Saskatchewan's annual budget gets 10% to 15% of its revenues every year from natural resource royalties. If my hon. colleague is suggesting the federal Liberal government should have less to do with oil and gas companies and should get out of the way, I would be 100% in agreement with that.

I would love to see the Liberals repeal Bill C-69, the “no more pipelines” bill. I would love to see them repeal Bill C-48, the west coast tanker ban. That way we could extract all of the resources that are literally underneath our feet and export them around the world. It is unfortunate that the Liberals always seem to get in the way.

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member clearly threw a touchdown with his excellent speech, and I thank him for his honesty and positive suggestions.

People in my riding on Vancouver Island tell me every day that they are struggling to afford groceries, gas and rent. They are going hungry and are losing their homes. These are all signs of a failing economy, among so many others.

Perhaps my colleague could speak to how this budget will deal with the continued failing of our economy. Does he see it as a budget that is going to make it better or continue to make it worse?

• (1705)

Michael Kram: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we are seeing more of the same from the Liberals on this budget, which is the continuation of 10 years of poor leadership. This is, of course, going to lead to higher costs at the grocery store and higher costs for Canadians who are struggling to make ends meet.

I would like to quote our former prime minister, Justin Trudeau, if I may, from just five years ago. He said, “Interest rates are at historic lows, Glen.... And as we move forward, because of historically low interest rates, the debt servicing costs will be low.” We can see now that leadership from the Liberals was totally misguided. Canadians are paying more and more on debt servicing charges from the deficit.

Vince Gasparro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Bay of Quinte.

We are facing the greatest threat to our sovereignty in generations. Unjustified tariffs are hurting Canadian businesses, workers and families, while global instability is disrupting our supply chains and driving uncertainty to levels we have not seen in decades. We are being confronted with a new and evolving set of challenges. The fact is, the world has changed and Canada must change with it. Budget 2025 is a call to action to protect what we have, build the Canada of the future and empower Canadians to drive this change.

Government Orders

History shows us the way. In a time of global crisis, C.D. Howe transformed Canada from an agricultural economy into a modern industrial powerhouse. Under Howe's tenure, Canada quadrupled our national industrial production, built the St. Lawrence Seaway and modernized Canada's largest cities. At the time, we created the department of defence production to streamline procurement, turning Canada into the fourth-largest producer of war materials in the allied forces even though we had one of the smallest populations. Howe understood that transforming Canada's economy required significant investment to jump-start factories and to modernize Canada's infrastructure.

We do not have to look abroad when our own history offers a clear blueprint to build Canada strong. Just as Howe responded to the existential threat of global war with industrial might, we must respond to today's economic threats with the same ingenuity, resolve and conviction. He knew then, as we know now, that we cannot cut our way to growth; we must invest.

The era of relying solely on deeply integrated trade with the United States is over. Our country cannot be subject to the whims of any foreign leader, and we must build infrastructure, industry and sustainable development projects at speeds that we have not seen in generations.

We are investing over \$60 billion in capital investment for the infrastructure of the future, including nuclear power, carbon capture, critical minerals, offshore wind and high-speed rail. The new Major Projects Office will fast-track these nation-building projects and coordinate financing to help build projects faster. These projects will connect our country, attract needed capital and create high-paying jobs.

Beyond the Major Projects Office, we are making investments in research and development to foster innovation and increase productivity. We are cutting red tape that slows private investment, and our government has already passed the One Canadian Economy Act, which removes federal trade barriers.

Our buy Canadian policy will catalyze our vast natural resources so that we can be our own best customer. When we build, we will do so first with Canadian goods and suppliers. We will build our country with Canadian steel, Canadian aluminum, Canadian lumber and Canadian workers.

I have a background in climate finance, and the importance of building a low-carbon economy in the face of mounting climate risks cannot be overstated. By leveraging strategic tax credits to spur private investment in clean technology and carbon capture, we will position Canada at the forefront of clean energy and advanced manufacturing, turning innovation into sustainable growth.

Budget 2025 also invests in the technology of the future, with dedicated funding for advanced robotics, quantum computing and AI infrastructure that will firmly establish Canada's place as a global leader. These technologies will power the next generation of Canadian industry, from clean energy to precision agriculture, and will turn growth into jobs for Canadians.

However, to build prosperity, we must protect what we have. As foreign conflicts and economic instability increase the risks we face, we must enhance our existing strengths and build new ones.

Our new government is investing \$81.1 billion in national defence, which represents the largest increase in defence spending in generations. Our defence industrial strategy will strengthen our industrial capabilities, will give us the tools we need to meet our defence requirements and will confront the crises of the 21st century.

● (1710)

To this end, our new government has created the Defence Investment Agency, which will overhaul and streamline Canada's defence procurement. This new agency will build domestic manufacturing and supply chains so the Canadian Armed Forces have the world-class equipment they need and deserve. These investments will help Canada realize its NATO commitments and enhance our collective security.

Our new government is also taking measures to protect Canadians here at home through the toughest anti-trafficking and border protection laws in Canadian history, protecting our communities from gun trafficking and illegal drugs like fentanyl. To support this initiative we are hiring 1,000 new RCMP personnel and 1,000 new CBSA officers to enforce these laws and keep our country safe, while stricter bail and sentencing laws will ensure that repeat violent offenders are behind bars.

Finally, budget 2025 will make life more affordable by spending less on government operations so we can refocus investment to grow our economy and protect the programs that make life more affordable for Canadians. We have already cut income taxes for 22 million Canadians and launched automatic federal benefits for the 2026 tax year, which will reach up to 5.5 million low-income Canadians to ensure they receive the critical government benefits they qualify for.

We have removed the HST for first-time homebuyers, helping more young Canadians achieve the dream of home ownership. Build Canada Homes will catalyze the creation of an entirely new Canadian housing industry that uses modern methods of construction to boost productivity and at scale, which will help add more housing and a diversity of housing for more Canadians.

Our government is also protecting the programs that matter most to Canadians, programs such as pharmacare, dental care and child care. Canada's social safety net is the envy of the world and we will protect the programs Canadians rely on. This is a nation-building moment. Just as in C.D. Howe's time we built the railways, the seaway and the transcontinental highway, our new government is building the digital, energy and transportation networks that will power Canada into the 21st century. These investments will connect Canadians, strengthen our economy and protect our sovereignty. Budget 2025 is a blueprint for a stronger, more resilient Canada, a Canada better positioned to manage the challenges of this new age of instability.

We do not choose the times we live in, but we do choose how we respond. Budget 2025 is a part of our answer. We will build big. We will act fast, and we will build a Canada that stands strong, sovereign and united because we believe in Canada.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have sat through five or six of these Liberal budget speeches over the years and every one of them promises that finally we are going to tackle Canada's productivity challenges. We are doing it again. Here is a headline in today's *The Globe and Mail*, "Canada is stuck in a 'vicious circle' of low productivity, Bank of Canada says".

Why should Canadians be at all confident that the Liberal government is finally going to tackle this productivity problem when it has been promising it for years and it is still lagging? What is different today?

• (1715)

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, the biggest change is that we have a new Prime Minister and new members of Parliament who come from the private sector. Our new government has laid out a plan that is focused on rebuilding our economy to deal with the challenges of the 21st century.

I listed in my speech a series of investments our new government is making. A lot of it is built around improving and increasing the productivity of our country. Investing in productive assets that generate revenue and that improve the productivity of the nation is very different from spending money on operating expenses.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about the budget implementation bill, which has been voted on. The Bloc Québécois had very specific, reasonable and well-thought-out demands for this budget to address the needs of Quebec. I think we have to strike a balance between the need to control public finances and the need to help people who need help.

I will come back to the request we made to ensure fairness for all seniors aged 65 and over in terms of the pension benefits they receive. We want to end the two-tiered system where people aged 65 to 74 receive a different amount than people aged 75 and over.

Last week, during the break week, I got a call from Mr. Poulin of the AQDR, the Association québécoise de défense des droits des personnes retraitées et préretraitées, a Quebec association promoting the rights of people who are retired or nearing retirement. We had a long talk. His members want fair treatment. At the start of the

Government Orders

week, while I was on the road, someone from FADOQ called me to ask how we planned to revive this file. The Liberals downright forgot about seniors in the last budget, and people are counting on the Bloc Québécois.

What does my colleague have to say about that?

[English]

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, I only heard part of the question, but I will try to answer it as best I can.

What I can say to the hon. member is that this budget takes, first of all, a pan-Canadian approach. Secondly, it tries to address the challenges that Canadians are facing as a whole. The seniors who helped build this country deserve the utmost respect and care for their hard work and the sacrifices they have made over decades in this country.

I respect the hon. member's question in regard to what this budget does, but when we are creating jobs and we are investing in assets—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his support of the budget here in the House. The member spoke about his private sector experience and I think we see in this budget, repeatedly, the influence that extensive private sector experience brings to the government.

Would the member like to expand on the difference in perspectives between the private sector and the government?

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, having private sector influence and experience, and bringing it to government, adds a great perspective in terms of what we are seeing in this budget: the investments that are being made, the reduction in operating expenses and the fact that we are focusing on dealing with the challenges of the 21st century.

If the only thing I had done in my life was get elected, I would have been doing the residents and citizens in my riding of Eglington—Lawrence a huge disservice. To meet the challenges of the 21st century, we need that private sector experience.

Chris Malette (Bay of Quinte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in today's debate in support of Bill C-15, the budget implementation act.

Budget 2025 arrives at a time when the rules-based international order and trading system that powered Canada's prosperity for decades are being reshaped, threatening our sovereignty, our prosperity and our values. This is not a time for passive stewardship. Canada must pursue active, ambitious nation building.

Government Orders

Budget 2025 is the government's plan to meet the moment by harnessing Canada's strengths, including its wealth of natural resources, a skilled and diverse workforce, and well-established stability and democratic values. In order to do that, we understand that we need to spend less so Canada can invest more. Leadership means making smart strategic investments while preserving the strength that comes from having the lowest net-to-GDP ratio of the G7, a strong fiscal position and a clear path to long-term sustainability. We have the resources and the people we need to thrive and compete in today's global economy.

Bill C-15 is essential to building a Canada that is confident, secure and resilient for today and for generations to come. That is why I am urging all hon. members to support the speedy passage of Bill C-15, so Canada can advance toward these goals. With my time today, I would like to outline some of the reasons why.

We will spend less to invest more. Budget 2025 introduces a new approach to fiscal discipline and strategic investment. The government will spend less on government operations so it can invest more in workers, businesses and nation-building infrastructure. To achieve this goal, government itself must become much more productive by rightsizing, cutting red tape and wasteful spending, and adopting new and innovative technologies such as artificial intelligence at scale. The government would balance Canada's operating budget within three years by making responsible, pragmatic choices, shifting the composition of spending toward capital investments that would grow the economy and prosperity for Canadians.

The government would slow growth in direct program spending from 8% to under 1%. The savings plan means Canadians can count on their government to be more efficient in delivering services that matter, while reducing operational costs. This is where Bill C-15 comes in. Bill C-15 is key to budget 2025's objective to deliver on the comprehensive expenditure review, which will focus on core priorities and ensure less is spent on the day-to-day running of government. Savings would be achieved by restructuring operations, consolidating internal services and rightsizing programs. The approach would also return the size of the public service to a more sustainable level.

The federal government played an instrumental role in ensuring that Canada weathered the COVID-19 pandemic far better than most of our G7 and OECD peers. However, a new set of challenges is now upon us, and returning the public service to sustainable pre-COVID levels would help us meet those challenges. The comprehensive expenditure review would achieve savings of \$9 billion in 2026-27, \$10 billion in 2027-28 and \$13 billion in 2028-29. Combined with other savings and revenues in budget 2025, this would total \$60 billion over five years, starting this year, 2025-26.

Making government more efficient is not just about rightsizing the public service, but also about making sure government can help drive productivity growth that can support higher wages, strengthen Canada's private sector investment and improve Canada's resilience to future shocks. Bill C-15 would amend the Red Tape Reduction Act to empower all ministers with authority to enable regulatory sandboxes. It would give a responsible minister the authority to grant temporary exemptions from legislation or regulations to allow for testing of products, services, processes or new regulatory approaches. The proposed amendments would cut red tape that slows

private investment, limits trade and labour mobility, and restricts competition.

• (1720)

In a similar way, the government is also committed to making the public sector more efficient. Legislative requirements, such as duplicative reporting or cumbersome approvals processes, consume a significant amount of public servants' time, diverting them from tasks that provide greater value to Canadians.

The government will conduct a review to identify additional legislative amendments to, for example, streamline low-risk internal processes, modernize outdated requirements, and eliminate unnecessary and burdensome reporting requirements.

In conclusion, Bill C-15 and budget 2025 are critical steps toward securing a stronger, more prosperous Canada in an increasingly uncertain world. I implore the hon. members here today to support the speedy passage of the bill so that we can get it working for Canada as soon as possible.

• (1725)

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing the terms “buy Canadian” and “buy Canadian steel.” It sounds good. It appeals to patriotic Canadians, but, tragically, it is say one thing and do the other.

I wonder if the member opposite could please explain to Canadians how buying ferries from China, with Chinese steel, buying LNG terminals, facilities from Korea, with Korean and Chinese steel, from an American company, is buying Canadian? Perhaps the member could explain that for us.

Chris Malette: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, at the time of those announcements, and the member would well know, representing that part of Canada, there were in fact no Canadian bidders on any of those projects. His own British Columbia provincial government has now implored any future investments in that regard to in fact buy Canadian, as this government is promoting.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a question about something that is of great concern to us in the Bloc Québécois.

At the end of Bill C-15, which is quite lengthy, there is a part that gives a minister the power to decide that a law will not apply to certain companies. This greatly expands the minister's discretionary power. It may even be a step toward arbitrary use of power. It also follows up on Bill C-5, which was passed here under closure, unfortunately.

I would like my colleague to explain why we should continue this trend of giving so much discretionary power that, should a minister agree, some companies will be able to sidestep the application of the law.

[English]

Chris Malette: Mr. Speaker, I refer back to the portion of my speech in which I said we will empower ministers at their discretion to, in fact, streamline and remove redundant and cumbersome regulations that have been determined, after careful consideration, to be an impediment to progress.

It is not a step taken lightly, to empower these ministers to do this, but in fact, it is all part of budget 2025's plan to empower these ministers to expedite progress in a meaningful but carefully considered fashion.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member formerly served at a municipal level, and I am wondering what he sees in the budget, specifically, that benefits municipalities in Ontario and across Canada.

Chris Malette: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member, who is a fellow former municipal councillor.

As we have seen across Canada, municipalities have been facing challenges for infrastructure investments for their own infrastructure and facilities. The budget itself includes \$5.1 billion for infrastructure funding that we will be implementing across the board to help municipalities upgrade and increase the energy efficiency and modernization of these facilities.

As my colleague knows, a frequent challenge of our municipalities is maintaining the billions in infrastructure that we already have.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

LIVING DONOR RECOGNITION MEDAL ACT

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC) moved that Bill C-234, An Act respecting the establishment and award of a Living Donor Recognition Medal, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a living donor is someone who donates all or part of an organ to save the life of a fellow Canadian. I am a living donor. On December 8, 2003, I donated part of my liver to save the life of my son Tyler, but I am not alone. Across Canada, there are hundreds of people alive today because someone bravely, generously and selflessly gave a part of their body to another person to save their life. Living donors exemplify the highest ideals of self-

Private Members' Business

lessness, yet Canada lacks a formal system to celebrate their contributions. My bill, Bill C-234, will recognize these remarkable individuals through the creation of the living donor recognition medal.

I am immensely proud of the fact that the House has united behind this non-partisan effort. Today, I will be speaking to the bill, but I will also give a voice to my fellow colleagues from all parties who are not able to get a speaking opportunity today. This will demonstrate how broad and non-partisan this initiative truly is. The joint seconders of the bill come from all provinces in a strong voice of support. I have received support from members of all political parties, and I am extremely thankful for their support. It shows Canadians that we can unite to do the right thing when we set politics aside. We are all motivated by the selfless gifts these donors have given.

As the Liberal member for Ottawa West—Nepean has stated, “This bill will give much-needed recognition to people who are the most deserving. Their heartwarming stories of selflessness are an inspiration.”

My colleague from Long Range Mountains said, “I know a living donor, and I have seen first-hand the tremendous sacrifice it takes to give someone another lease on life. These heroes do not do it for recognition. They do it out of love and selflessness, but they deserve to be recognized for giving the ultimate gift: the gift of life.”

She went on to say, “Someone we love actually received two kidneys, one from his brother and one from his sister. Life before the transplant was filled with exhaustion and limitations, but receiving a new kidney brought hope and energy back. It transformed misery into freedom and restored a sense of normal life.”

These donors stepped forward, took on risk and gave the gift of life. To me and those they saved, they are true heroes.

The Liberal member for Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam stated, “Creating a living donor recognition medal is an important step to recognize those special Canadians who gave a piece of themselves so that others can live. Those who step forward, out of kindness and compassion, [to] show selflessness to help friends, family members and sometimes strangers, are Canada's unsung heroes. This medal recognizes their contribution to humanity.”

Living donors are not paid and not allowed to be compensated for their donations, and this is a good thing. They have freely given what they can to save the life of another. It is a priceless gift.

The member for Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay knows this. As she stated, “The choice to be an organ donor is done without reward, but the everyday Canadians who make this choice are choosing to save a life. Their courage deserves recognition, which is why I was proud to cosponsor my colleague's bill to establish a living donor recognition medal.”

Private Members' Business

The leader of the Green Party spoke to their true motivation when she stated, “Every year, hundreds of Canadians respond with extraordinary compassion and courage to donate their organs to the thousands of Canadians awaiting life-saving organ transplants. I fully support Bill C-234, which would rightly honour living donors, recognizing the selfless gift of life they provide and the profound impact they have on our health care system and communities.”

• (1735)

As I have mentioned in the House before, a transplant recipient once said to me, “I just don't feel that a thank you card is enough. I wish we could do a proper job of recognizing them.”

My colleague for Calgary Centre knows that we need to do more. He stated, “These individuals give the gift of life, often quietly and without fanfare. A national medal is a meaningful way to honour their extraordinary generosity and to remind us all of the power of selflessness in building a stronger, more compassionate country.”

Living donors volunteer to give a part of their body to another person to save their life, and this selfless and altruistic gesture is worthy of significant recognition. We regularly recognize citizens for bravery, selfless acts and compassion toward their fellow citizens. It should be no different for living donors.

The member for Don Valley West agrees. He stated, “Every day, Canadians waiting for organ transplants depend on the generosity and courage of donors. By establishing the living donor recognition medal, Parliament is honouring these extraordinary individuals whose selflessness saves lives, strengthens families and reflects the very best of who we are as a country.”

The leader of the NDP said, “Living organ donors embody the highest ideal of generosity, compassion and humanity. Establishing a national medal is a fitting tribute to their extraordinary contributions to the life of others and to our society as a whole.”

The most important part of the bill is that this medal would raise awareness and discussion around living donations. It would encourage others to explore living donation and the power it holds. It will save more lives.

My Liberal friend, the member for Humber River—Black Creek, understands this. She said, “I'm proud to support Bill C-234, which recognizes the truly stunning generosity of living organ donors in Canada. Their sacrifice saves lives and shows us all what it means to be a champion of our better nature. Let us celebrate their selfless courage and compassion as they inspire us all.”

I could not agree more.

My colleague, the member for Riding Mountain, also recognized the power that such a medal could have when he stated, “We need more organ donors in Canada. That's why I fully support Bill C-234 to create a living donor recognition medal. This award will increase awareness, recognize donors and help save lives.”

If we do this, Canada will be only the second country in the world to add living donors to their national honour system. By taking a lead in this, we further demonstrate our belief that this is the right thing to do.

My Liberal friend, the member for Laval—Les Îles, also sees the opportunity for Canada to lead. He said, “It would be a source of pride to see Canada become only the second country to formally honour living donors. They are unsung heroes who fully deserve this recognition. Although Canada is a prosperous country with well-established health care infrastructure, this law reminds us that we are nothing without the generosity and dedication of others. Putting ourselves in someone else's shoes is a fundamental democratic act that must be emphasized and revalued.”

My Liberal colleague, the member for South Shore—St. Margarets, said it best when she said, “This legislation recognizes a simple truth: that the gift of life is among the greatest acts of service one human being can offer another. In honouring living organ donors, we'll celebrate a quiet heroism that saves lives and strengthens the fabric of our nation.”

We do not just have to take it from hon. members. There are also those on the front lines of our health care system.

• (1740)

Our Liberal colleague the member for Winnipeg West is an emergency room doctor and knows about these issues first-hand. He stated, “By seconding Bill C-234, I want to highlight the profound impact living organ donors have on our communities. Each act of donation ripples beyond the recipient, bringing families, friends, and neighbours together in gratitude and hope. This medal will honor those extraordinary Canadians whose generosity strengthens the bonds that make our communities resilient and compassionate.”

The medal would provide the only official recognition and acknowledgement of critical and life-saving donations. It would be a legitimate, tangible and significant way a donor could be thanked in a non-monetary way. My colleague the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan understands this and the importance such an honour would have. He stated, “I am proud to support Bill C-234, which recognizes the incredible generosity of Canadians who become living organ donors. These men and women represent the best of who we are—people willing to make profound sacrifices to give others the gift of life. Honouring their compassion and courage is the right thing to do.”

In Canada, 4,700 individuals await life-saving organ transplants, with most relying on living donors, selfless individuals who donate all or part of an organ to save another's life. Three-quarters of people awaiting a transplant are in need of a kidney, and living donors are an option.

The recognition would not only validate the donor's sacrifices but also spark vital conversation about organ donation, reducing the transplant waiting list and saving more lives. The proposal has garnered support in all parties for its simplicity and impact. A living donor recognition medal would serve as a powerful symbol of gratitude, ensuring that donors are thanked appropriately for saving the life of another. It aligns with Canada's tradition of honour, bravery and compassion, placing living donors alongside other honoured citizens.

The medal has the potential to inspire and educate. By recognizing living donors, Canada could lead by example, reinforcing the importance of living donor donation and celebrating those who give the gift of life. The medal would be a tangible, non-monetary way to acknowledge their altruism, raising awareness about living donation and encouraging more Canadians to consider this life-saving act.

I am confident all members will want to support the proposal, and I hope I can count on their strong support. Canadians will view this as a worthwhile and deserving recognition, and now it is up to us to make it happen. As my colleague the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake stated simply, “Honouring living donors with a Living Donor Recognition Medal recognizes their courage and generosity, while helping to raise awareness and encourage more life-saving acts.”

I will give my final words to my colleague the member for Charlottetown. He summed it up when he said, “Living organ donors are our unsung heroes. Their gift of life is the ultimate altruistic act and selfless gesture. The bravery and courage it takes to give a part of yourself to save another is worthy of the highest of recognitions and appreciation. Canada is truly fortunate to have individuals willing to make such contributions and the least we can do is appropriately thank them.”

I agree wholeheartedly. Let us get it done and save more lives.

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Edmonton Manning for introducing Bill C-234, as well as to commend him for his passion for this topic and also for his work for his son.

My question to you is, are you aware of any living donor holidays? Are there any national days that would be in addition to the potential medal?

• (1745)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The member should address questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Edmonton Manning.

Ziad Aboultaif: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any specific awards such as the one I am proposing. April is Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Month, which was created through the effort of some NGOs in their jobs, trying to bring awareness. I continue to help and to support their initiative; however, I believe we need to do more.

We need to recognize and bring awareness to Canadians about how important it is to have more living donors so we can reduce the 4,700 cases, which, by the way, have been in the system since I in-

Private Members' Business

troduced my first bill 10 years ago to establish an organ donor registry in Canada. The legislation did not make it through, but I am hopeful the bill before us will be a successful attempt to bring more awareness and make sure Canadians understand that it is an important thing. It would be recognized publicly.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Edmonton Manning for this bill, and especially for sharing that very touching story about donating an organ to his son.

The only minor issue the Bloc Québécois has with the bill is that the Canadian Organ and Tissue Donors Association already holds a ceremony to pay tribute to posthumous donors and living donors. In addition, two medals already exist, namely the ambassador of health medal and the good Samaritan medal.

We simply need to ensure that the law recognizes the work already being done by organizations such as the Canadian Organ and Tissue Donors Association, Transplant Québec, Héma-Québec and Canadian Blood Services. I hope the member would agree that it is imperative to invite representatives of these organizations to appear before the committee to ensure that the recognition he wants to promote is aligned with the missions of these organizations.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[*English*]

Ziad Aboultaif: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the kind words and for the question. Absolutely, the nature and spirit of the bill is to recognize the heroes we do not even know about in Canada.

Working with organizations across the country is very important, and I believe this will be done. My office and I will be reaching out to many more organizations that we know of, and I thank the member for highlighting some today so we can work together, because as I said, the initiative is a non-partisan one. It needs to continue to be like this because, at the end of the day, we are all Canadians. We have one goal: to help each other and to make sure that we set examples for others.

[*Translation*]

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for this wonderful bill, which I believe everyone in this chamber should support.

There is an organization in my riding called Chain of Life. Its president and founder, Lucie Dumont, created it to promote organ donation. My colleague mentioned education. Chain of Life aims to educate young people, aged 15 to 17, in English classes and takes that opportunity to talk about this issue. This bill promotes recognition by awarding medals, but it would also help inform the public about organ donation.

Private Members' Business

I myself have signed my organ donor card, using my Quebec driver's licence. There are 800 people waiting for organ donations in Quebec.

I think this is an extraordinary initiative by my colleague.

[*English*]

Ziad Aboultaif: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his support. He brought other cases to my attention, and other organizations that are doing some good work. I am adding another chapter to that through the House; I am giving the House, all MPs in all parties, the opportunity to work together with all Canadians. For Canadians who are most in need of organs, the bill would facilitate that, make their lives easier and make the lives of people in their communities, their workplace and their families better. We can all be working together to achieve that.

• (1750)

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Moncton—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased today to stand in the House in support of Bill C-234, which calls for the creation of a living donor recognition medal.

Let me start by telling members why I am supporting the bill. For starters, how can anyone not be moved by the experience of the member for Edmonton Manning, who as a father of a child stricken by a critical illness, donated part of his own liver to save his son's life? Many brave Canadians over the years have also been willing to do the same by being a living donor to save someone's life, whether it be a family member, a friend or sometimes even a stranger. That is completely inspiring.

In my estimation, that kind of selflessness and courage captures the best of Canadian values and of human values, and it should be justly rewarded. We already reward selflessness of a different sort with the Sovereign's Medal for Volunteers, for example. We also bestow several military and civilian honours on Canadians who have risked danger to come to the aid of others in emergencies.

[*Translation*]

Creating this type of award to celebrate these qualities, particularly in the context of living organ donation, seems to me to be the next logical step.

[*English*]

I support the bill also because of the experience of two friends of mine, Mr. Dan McLaughlin and Michael Walsh.

Just a few months ago, Dan McLaughlin lived a thrill of a lifetime. During the Second World War, his father joined the RCAF, and like thousands of airmen from across Canada and the British Commonwealth, he honed his flying skills here in Canada in a Harvard trainer aircraft. Just a handful of Harvards are still flying today, but Dan recently had the chance to fly one of them, eighty-four years after his dad first climbed into a Harvard cockpit.

[*Translation*]

He kindly showed me the photos of that amazing experience, and I have to say that the expression on his face as he was flying through the air in a plane just like the one his dad piloted almost a century ago was absolutely priceless.

[*English*]

I tell this story because absolutely none of this would have happened if Dan had not received a life-saving kidney transplant six years ago.

My friend Mike Walsh received a kidney transplant seven years ago, and today he is managing his health and making the most of the years he thought he would never have.

Mike and Dan, who know each other well, went through similar trials as each waited for the donation of a kidney. They both did everything they could to stay positive and hopeful, but they also did what a reasonable person would do when the odds are stacked against them: They got their affairs in order. They said what needed to be said to their family members and friends, and they also made their funeral arrangements.

At one point Dan was so desperate to find a donor that he even put an advertisement on his car and drove around the city in hopes that someone would see it.

[*Translation*]

At last, after what seemed like a never-ending wait during which he had almost given up hope of his prayers being answered, against all odds, Dan received a kidney just in time, just as his time was running out.

[*English*]

Just like that, Dan suddenly received a new lease on life because of another family's tragic loss.

This is where Mike Walsh's case is very different. Mike had the extraordinary luck of finding a living donor thanks to his membership and active involvement in a local Rotary club. Mike lives just a few blocks from me in Moncton, but he happened to be far away from home at a Rotary event in Seattle, Washington, when a chance conversation with a fellow Rotarian from Washington state led to the man's giving Mike one of his kidneys.

Both my friends beat extraordinary odds in their own journey, but unfortunately, too many of the friends they made in the transplant community of people who were also waiting on the organ transplant list were not as lucky.

I think most members of the House, and indeed most Canadians in general, may have friends or loved ones like Mike and Dan. Most of us also probably know someone who did not survive because they did not get the transplant they needed. The saddest part of all of this is that, as we all know, the kidney is an organ that can be transplanted from a living donor. Living donors could greatly increase the life-saving transplants we could do in Canada, but only, of course, if we have more people stepping up.

The fact that Mike received his transplant kidney from a living donor did not speed up the process. In fact, just like Dan, he waited many years before the stars aligned and a match was found. Just think of how many Canadians' lives could be saved if we encouraged more people to donate a kidney or even a piece of their own liver while they are still alive.

I believe that Bill C-234 could help raise awareness, as my fellow colleague indicated, and encourage more Canadians to step forward to make this important gift. I also support the bill because I strongly believe it is simply the right thing to do. We should show our gratitude as a society to the people who make the sacrifice to save Canadians lives.

• (1755)

[Translation]

In conclusion, I just want to say that donations from all living donors are truly gifts of life. They are, by definition, priceless.

[English]

We could never pay someone enough to be a living donor. No amount of money could ever reimburse someone for giving so much of themselves to someone else, and that is why I personally support the idea of the member for Edmonton Manning, someone I also consider a dear friend, who proposed the bill, because the gift of life is truly priceless. We should reward living donors with a token of gratitude that is also priceless, a medal that can serve both as a tangible symbol of our nation's gratitude and also as a mark of recognition to ensure that the donor's selflessness, courage and honour are underlined.

Once again I offer many thanks to the member for Edmonton Manning. My friend has done well.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak to Bill C-234, which seeks to establish a medal of recognition for citizens and permanent residents who have made a living organ donation in Canada.

The bill is relatively straightforward. It creates and implements this medal, and leaves the details, such as the design, eligibility criteria and the awarding process, to be determined by regulations. Certain exclusions are also provided for members of Parliament, senators and other persons excluded by regulation who would not be eligible to receive the medal. Furthermore, this medal can only be awarded once. The government must submit a report on the implementation of this measure.

It is a fairly straightforward bill that nevertheless exists in a political context, given that it was introduced by the member for Edmonton Manning, who is its sponsor. This is personal for him. He donated part of his liver to his son in 2003, and it should be noted that he had already introduced a previous bill, Bill C-223, for a national strategy for organ donation. The Bloc Québécois rejected the bill at the time for a number of reasons, but this new version is much more acceptable. As for the positions of the other parties, it is quite simple. From what we have seen so far, I think we are heading toward unanimous support at second reading. It is a fine example of humanity.

Private Members' Business

However, there is a potential problem, as I mentioned to my colleague earlier. There is overlap with existing awards, such as the annual ceremony held by the Canadian Organ and Tissue Donation Association, the ambassador of health medal, and the good Samaritan medal. It is also important to hear from the Canadian Organ and Tissue Donation Association, Transplant Québec, Héma-Québec, and Canadian Blood Services in committee to avoid duplication of their work and to recognize all that they do. This will be an opportunity to hear from them in committee.

We in the Bloc Québécois will be supporting this bill. We want to highlight Quebec's major historic contribution in terms of organ donation, and I will come back to that a little later. As I said, we are somewhat critical of the fact that the bill fails to explicitly recognize this contribution in its preamble, along with everything that has been done in Quebec. We would actually like to highlight the essential role of Transplant Québec, which was created by Quebec doctors and has been at the heart of the Quebec system for over 50 years now. I will also come back to that a little later. In my speech, I will talk about the roles of the various agencies, provide a historical overview and conclude with a few statistics.

First, Transplant Québec is responsible for organ donation coordination, promotion, research and training. Since 1992, it has managed Quebec's single waiting list, a national feature that is unique to us. According to recent data from 2024, there were 206 donors, 556 transplants performed, and 856 people on the waiting list. The Canadian Organ and Tissue Donors Association holds an annual ceremony to honour living and deceased donors. It was founded in 1983 and promotes organ donation in Quebec and Canada. Since 1987, it has involved several police services and partners in the rapid transport of organs, which is often a vital step. It is the Quebec equivalent of Canadian Blood Services, which is responsible for the rest of the country.

Second, I want to go over a bit of history. I will try to present a somewhat structured timeline to explain and highlight Quebec's important role in the history of transplantation. First, in 1958, the first kidney transplant took place at the Royal Victoria Hospital in Montreal. In 1965 and 1968, the first lung and heart transplants were performed at the Montreal General Hospital. In 1970, three transplant physicians from Montreal founded Métro-Transplantation, the predecessor of Transplant Québec.

Between 1984 and 1992, there was a consolidation, funding from the ministry of health and social services, which granted it a provincial mandate, and the creation of processes for allocating and identifying donors. Finally, in 1985, the Royal Victoria Hospital performed Quebec's first heart-lung transplant, an important historical moment. Between 2001 and 2007, clinical nurses and liaison nurses were deployed. In March 2001, the ministry of health and social services allocated \$1.2 million to this pilot project.

Private Members' Business

• (1800)

Since 2005, world organ donation and transplant day has been celebrated on October 17. It is an opportunity to acknowledge the importance of this gift of life. From 2007 to 2008, the Quebec government consolidated its assets and developed Québec-Transplant. Then, in 2011, the name changed to Transplant Québec.

Third, I would like to present some statistics about women and organ donation. According to Health Canada, 62% of living organ donors in Canada outside of Quebec are women.

According to Health Canada's information on living donors, men accounted for 38% of living donors in 2009, while women accounted for 62% of living donors. Also according to Health Canada, 59% of deceased donors outside Quebec were men and 41% were women. Interestingly enough, gender inequalities are also observed in the field of health and the Standing Committee on Health even conducted a study on those gender inequalities. We can see that there is a significant gender dynamic when it comes to organ donation. Living donors tend to be women, which could reflect social roles such as caregiving or biases in the transplant system.

It is also worth mentioning that older women in particular may be exposed to specific risks. For example, studies outside of Canada show that older women who are victims of domestic violence may suffer from significant comorbidities in terms of mental and physical health. This may be worth noting. Statistics on seniors and organ donation show that there are potential donors aged 60 and over.

According to the Canadian Institute for Health Information report, from 2008 to 2012, approximately 23% of deceased donors in Canada were aged 60 and over. However, there is significant variation between provinces. For example, Quebec had more than 34% of deceased donors aged 60 and over, according to the Canadian Institute for Health Information. The report notes that the estimated "potential" for older donors may be overestimated because there are many deaths in this age group. However, not all of these deaths can lead to safe donations. There are medical risks and exclusion criteria. This must be taken into account when discussing organ donation.

The age of donors in Quebec also comes into play. According to Transplant Québec's official statistics, the average age of deceased organ donors in Quebec between 2015 and 2024 was about 53 or 54 years. Transplant Québec's 2020 report also shows that deceased donor groups are broken down into two age groups: 61 to 70 years and 71 years and over. That is interesting, because it debunks some myths. People can donate organs at a much more advanced age. Organ donation is possible at any age in Quebec. According to the Quebec government's website, the oldest donor was 92 years old.

As I was saying, variations do occur, depending on the province. According to the Health Canada report, the frequency that organs from donors aged 60 and over are used varies greatly depending on the province. Some provinces use them a lot, others a lot less. The report suggests that these differences are likely more a matter of clinical practice than patient needs. The number of seniors is not the only factor. The criteria that organ donation and transplantation teams use to assess and accept seniors' organs also play a role.

This morning, I met with representatives of the Kidney Foundation of Canada. I also took part in the Kidney March in September back home in Granby. During the walk, I had a chance to speak with several living donors. One in 10 people in Canada suffers from kidney disease. That number is probably even higher because of undiagnosed cases. This means that 4 million people are affected, compared to 3.7 million people with diabetes. More than 6.2 million people in Canada are estimated to develop chronic kidney disease. It is the 11th leading cause of death in Canada. These chronic kidney diseases cost the health care system over \$40 billion annually. More than 49,000 people in Canada have advanced kidney disease, and 42% of patients are under the age of 65. Of the 4,700 people waiting for an organ donation in Canada, 71% hope to receive a kidney.

I would like to make one final point. I was reminded this morning of the importance of signing an organ donor card in case something happens, as well as the importance of discussing it with one's family before such a thing happens.

We must not forget that prevention is the best medicine. For proper prevention, we need health care transfers, as we have been calling for. We asked for \$11.6 billion over five years in the last budget, so we could invest not only in hospitals, but also in the entire system and in all the wonderful individuals who work there, the human resources who care for us every day.

I congratulate my colleague from Edmonton Manning for introducing this bill.

• (1805)

[*English*]

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be here tonight to talk about this wonderful bill. I thank my colleague for Edmonton Manning for sharing his story and his passion.

Before beginning my remarks on Bill C-234, I want to offer this House a brief update on our former colleague, well known to many here. My predecessor, Richard Cannings, recently underwent major surgery. I am really pleased to share that he is on the road to a full recovery. He served our communities in the south Okanagan and in West Kootenay with dedication and integrity for a decade. I know members across party lines will join me in wishing him strength and good health.

This is my first opportunity to rise and thank all the volunteers for Remembrance Day last week. There was an amazing turnout at the many legions and cenotaphs across my riding and across Canada.

Private Members' Business

Tonight I rise in support of Bill C-234, the living donor recognition medal act. This legislation proposes the creation of a national medal to honour Canadians who have donated one or more organs during their lifetime. Whenever possible, this medal would be presented publicly by a representative of the Crown, a senator or a member of Parliament, similar to how other honours, such as the King's Coronation Medal and the Sovereign's Medal for Volunteers, are awarded.

I have learned a lot since seconding this bill, and I cannot help but be touched by it. The intention is clear: to recognize extraordinary acts of generosity, to raise public awareness and, ultimately, to encourage more Canadians to consider becoming living donors.

The need for donors in our country is significant and urgent. According to the Canadian Institute for Health Information, at the end of 2024, more than 4,000 Canadians were waiting or temporarily on hold for an organ transplant, yet only 590 living donations occurred that year. Even when we consider posthumous donations, the gap between what is needed and what is available remains far too wide.

For patients on waiting lists, the passing of time adds not only emotional strain but medical complexity. Their conditions can often worsen as they wait. Many spend weeks, sometimes months, in hospital, unable to return home or resume normal life because they are waiting for a donor match that may never arrive. These extended stays place enormous pressure on families and caregivers, and they increase the strain on an already overburdened health care system.

Beyond the strain, the consequences can be tragic. In 2024, 217 Canadians died waiting for organ transplants. Behind each number is a family, a grieving spouse, a child or a parent whose loss may have been preventable. Recognizing people who choose to become living donors is not simply symbolic; it is part of creating a culture that encourages more Canadians to step forward and save lives.

Living donation is really an act of extraordinary compassion, as we heard our colleague speak to earlier. It is personal. Living donors often describe the experience as life-changing, not only for the recipient but for themselves. Many speak about a renewed sense of purpose, a deepened appreciation for their own health and an unbreakable connection to the person they have helped.

In my own community, I was moved by the story of local Shelley Hunt from Penticton, who chose to donate a kidney to a stranger. Her story was featured in the documentary called *Because I Can*, which highlights the power of living donation. Shelley said something that stayed with me. She said she constantly says that she wished kidneys grew back because she could do it again and again. That kind of spirit, that quiet, unwavering generosity, is exactly what this bill seeks to honour.

When the member for Edmonton Manning introduced this legislation, he asked me to second it, and I was proud to do so. I also offered the following words in support: The choice to be an organ donor is made without expectation of reward, but the Canadians who make this choice are choosing to save a life. Their courage deserves recognition.

• (1810)

I am not alone in this sentiment. Members from other parties have offered powerful endorsements, as we have heard. One colleague said that living organ donors embody the highest ideals of generosity, compassion and humanity. Another said that in honouring living organ donors, we celebrate a quiet heroism that saves lives and strengthens the fabric of our nation. A third added that the bill rightly honours living donors, recognizing the selfless gift of life that they provide and the profound impact they have on our health care system and our communities.

These comments were made by a New Democrat, a Liberal and a Green member. They were the words of the members for Vancouver Kingsway, South Shore—St. Margarets and Saanich—Gulf Islands. Their support reflects a genuine consensus on an issue that transcends partisanship.

It was nice to hear the support of my colleague from the Bloc Québécois. It was great to hear that Quebec has such a long and proud history of leadership in organ donation. I have heard stories of organ donors in Quebec, of donors who stepped forward for strangers, neighbours and loved ones, people who also deserve to be recognized nationally.

I am often asked by constituents why political parties cannot work together more often. I always say we can. The public may not always see it, but co-operation does happen. This bill is a perfect example of how members from every corner of this House can come together when we focus on what is most important: the lives and well-being of Canadians. As a new member, this makes me proud to be in this House and to be in this country.

Before concluding, I want to acknowledge the sponsor of this bill, the member for Edmonton Manning. His advocacy for this legislation is shaped by a deeply personal experience. He himself is a living donor, donating to his young son and giving him not only an organ but a future. His courage and the courage of so many living donors across the country are a powerful reminder of what this legislation seeks to honour.

Bill C-234 sends the simple yet profound message that living organ donors deserve national recognition for the life-saving act they provide. This medal would not create donors on its own, but it would shine a light on Canadians who choose to step forward. It would help normalize living donation, encourage conversation, inspire others and celebrate extraordinary generosity.

We may never know how many future transplants start because someone attended a medal ceremony or heard the story of a donor in their own community. If this honour encourages even a few more Canadians to consider giving the gift of life, the impact will be immeasurable.

Private Members' Business

For all these reasons, I strongly urge all members of this House to support Bill C-234. Let us stand together to recognize the Canadians whose generosity saves lives, strengthens families and gives hope to the thousands waiting for a second chance.

• (1815)

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today in strong support of Bill C-234, introduced by my colleague, the member for Edmonton Manning. This legislation would establish a living donor recognition medal, a meaningful and long-overdue way to honour Canadians who make one of the most selfless decisions a human can make, the decision to give life.

Today, 4,044 Canadians are waiting for a life-saving organ transplant. Behind each number is a family waiting for the phone to ring, hoping for another chance and living in that difficult space between fear and possibility, yet the hopeful truth is that most of these Canadians could be saved by a living donor. Living donors take the real risk. They undergo major surgery, stepping forward out of generosity, compassion and courage. They receive no compensation and often very little public recognition.

As the sponsor of this bill has shared so powerfully, on December 8, 2003, he donated part of his liver to save the life of his son, Tyler. This extraordinary act reflects the very best of who we are as Canadians, a quiet, determined courage rooted in love and responsibility, but he is not alone. Hundreds of Canadians today are alive because someone stood up and said, “Yes, I will help.” This could be a parent, like my fellow colleague was, a sibling, a friend or even a stranger. One transplant recipient once said that a thank-you card is not enough, saying, “I wish we could do a proper job of recognizing them.”

Bill C-234 answers that call. A living donor recognition medal would provide the first and only formal national honour for living organ donors. It is non-monetary, non-partisan and deeply meaningful. It is a way for us to say that their courage matters, their sacrifice is seen and their gift changed a life. Canada recognizes bravery, compassion and service. This bill would simply extend that principle to those who embody all three.

If adopted, Canada would become only the second country in the world to formally recognize living donors with a national honours system. That would send a positive, powerful signal, not only of gratitude but of leadership. It sparks conversation, shifts culture and encourages more Canadians to think seriously about organ donation.

I am especially proud to rise here as a Nova Scotian from South Shore—St. Margarets because Nova Scotia has been a leader in this area. We were the first jurisdiction in North America to introduce a presumed consent model, which is automatic donor registration with the option for individuals to opt out. This bold and compassionate policy recognizes a simple truth that more donation means more lives saved. It reflects something deep within our province's character, a belief in community, responsibility and looking out for one another, which are all values of Canadians.

While presumed consent addresses deceased donation, Bill C-234 complements that leadership by honouring those who choose

living donation. Together, these efforts form a continuum of care, one that ensures more Canadians can access the transplants they need and that those who make donation possible will receive the recognition they deserve.

• (1820)

In my own riding of South Shore—St. Margarets, I have heard the stories of parents hoping for more time with their children, of spouses supporting one another through illness and of neighbours rallying around families during moments of crisis. These stories remind me that public policy is never abstract. It lives in our communities, in our hospital rooms, around our kitchen tables and even in the classroom where I was a teacher before becoming a member of Parliament.

I remember that, just last year, in my citizenship class, I gave a current event that was all about living organ donors. As we read it together as a class and discussed it, all of a sudden I recognized that, at the back of the room, my resource support teacher had put his hand up. I asked Mr. Thorpe if he had a question or comment. He said that he was indeed a living donor, that seven years ago he had donated a part of his liver to a family member. It acts like that.

This medal will not solve our entire transplant backlog, but it will do something profoundly important, as the teacher I worked with before did. It will honour heroism. It will validate sacrifice. It will encourage new conversations about living donation, conversations that will save lives.

The bill has support across every party. Look at us here in the House today. Every region is represented through its sponsorship and every corner of the House is represented with the bill. That unity reflects something vital, that compassion is non-partisan, that gratitude is non-partisan and that saving lives is non-partisan.

Today, I am proud to stand as an official seconder of Bill C-234. I urge all members to support this initiative and to move it forward without delay. It is symbolic but symbols matter. Recognition changes culture; we spark conversations among families, workplaces and communities. This medal will not solve all organ shortages on its own, but it will help build that culture of support.

Let us honour those remarkable Canadians who give the greatest gift that one human can give to another, the gift of life.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to rise this evening to speak to Bill C-234, which was introduced by my colleague from Edmonton Manning. It is an important bill.

We know that private members' bills are often rooted in the member's personal experiences. In the case of my colleague, back in 2003, he showed selfless generosity by donating part of his liver to his son, who went on to live a good life. I want to commend him for taking the time to bring this bill forward. Few people at home know what a privilege it is to introduce a bill in the House of Commons, because it takes some luck to win the draw.

After that, the winning members need to choose a subject that they care about and want to bring forward in the House of Commons, a subject that can change things and improve the lives of the people around them. Today, we have a perfect example in the member for Edmonton Manning. He introduced a bill that is meaningful to him based on his personal and family experience. He wants to change people's lives by shining a light on the importance of living organ donation.

As my colleague from Shefford eloquently pointed out in her speech before mine, Quebec has been a leader in organ donation. The first doctors performed successful transplants and worked together over the years to create Transplant Québec, which is now a world-renowned model. Thanks to that organization, people can go on living. These are often lives that would have been at risk had it not been for organ donation.

Organ donation is important, which is why we need to take the time to promote it. My colleague is proposing that a medal be awarded to honour all living donors who donate one of their organs while they are alive, so that someone can continue living their life. We are talking about kidneys, lungs and other organs. It is often kidneys, as my colleague mentioned.

I would now like to shine a light on something that has not been discussed much. In Quebec, there is a week dedicated to promoting organ donation. During this week, municipalities are invited to raise a flag to raise public awareness about the importance of people signing the back of their health card to consent to organ donation. Many people are still unaware of this option and do not sign their health card. When an accident occurs and they lose their life, their organs, which are still viable, can be used to save the life of a very sick person who is eagerly awaiting an organ.

I have a friend named Nancy Lefebvre who developed kidney disease at a very young age. She waited several years for a kidney transplant, undergoing dialysis three times a week. She had to stop working because she had no energy. When someone is no longer working, when they are sick and spend their days on dialysis, it is hard for them to stay positive. They do not feel useful anymore and they are afraid of dying. Fortunately, Nancy eventually received a kidney thanks to a donation from someone who had sadly passed away. With this kidney, she was able to go back to work and live her life. She even served as my official agent during my election campaign. Every year, during National Organ and Tissue Donation Week and world organ donation and transplant day, she makes a

Adjournment Proceedings

point of reminding people how important it is to consent to organ donation and to talk about it, because it can transform the lives of many people.

• (1825)

Once again, I want to thank my colleague for allowing us to debate a very important subject this evening and draw attention to it through a medal for living donors.

I agree with my colleague from Shefford that we will have to focus on the regulations and work with the many organizations involved to honour and pay tribute to individuals whose generosity has allowed others to go on living. I congratulate my colleague. I have a strong feeling that we are going to debate and expand on this bill in committee.

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (1830)

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in Adjournment Proceedings to pursue a question I asked on October 23. That day may not immediately strike all members as one of deep significance, but October 24 every year is United Nations Day, and October 24 was actually the 80th birthday of the United Nations and the 80th anniversary of the United Nations Charter.

I rose and asked a question of the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, and she did me the honour of answering my question. It was not a bad answer; I want to share that right away, but we need to expand upon it.

I asked her where we are in the world of peacekeeping. Of course, former prime minister Lester B. Pearson, who was not prime minister at the time he did this, won the Nobel Peace Prize for resolving the Suez crisis and creating UN peacekeepers. It has been a long time since we had any bragging rights among the peacekeeping nations. One thing I lament deeply is that the Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre, which was set up in 1994, was closed in 2011. Not only did we close the Pearson centre for peacekeeping, but we dropped to the rank of 69th country in the world on the level of our peacekeeping engagement.

[*Translation*]

It is unacceptable for a country like Canada to throw up its hands in the face of threats of war. We are currently witnessing a significant increase in threats of war.

*Adjournment Proceedings**[English]*

We did not think 10 to 20 years ago that we could see a land war, with Putin invading Ukraine, but we saw a reversal in the nuclear arms race, thanks to the work of former U.S. president Ronald Reagan and then U.S.S.R. president Mikhail Gorbachev. Those two individuals put the world on track to eliminating nuclear weapons with things like the SALT treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Now we are seeing for the first time, with great horror, the nuclear clock ticking closer to midnight.

I was gratified when the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs answered me, and I will quote her: “Canada believes in a world free of nuclear weapons, and the current arsenals around the world remain far too large.” Canada’s record does not make it clear that we believe in a world free of nuclear weapons. There is now, which has entered into force with enough countries around the world signing and ratifying it, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

I would have been so proud as a Canadian if my country had been a leader in those negotiations, as we were in the Ottawa process to ban land mines. However, we have not signed the treaty. We refused to show up at the negotiations on the treaty. Now that we have meetings of the nations that are parties to the treaty, Canada does not even send an official observer group. Those of us parliamentarians who are concerned about nuclear war go to those meetings, as the only examples of Canadian concern, as part of the global parliamentarians who want to end nuclear war.

We see wonderful efforts from the grassroots across Canada, many participating in something called the peace train. We have the work of leaders like our former ambassador for disarmament, the Hon. Doug Roche. Of course, there is no current ambassador for nuclear disarmament. The position does not exist.

I hope for a better answer tonight.

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to both address the important question raised by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands about Canada’s long-standing commitment and leadership on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and also to thank her for continually raising what I believe personally, and I believe our government believes, to be a critically important issue for humanity.

Canada’s reputation as a champion for peacekeeping and human rights has already been well noted. It did not emerge by accident or nostalgia. It was built because Canada chose to lead, and we continue to choose to lead through diplomacy, through multilateral engagement in institutions and through the difficult technical and often incremental work that actually reduces nuclear risks. That work continues today.

Our approach is anchored in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the NPT, which is the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation and disarmament architecture. The NPT remains the most effective pathway towards verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament. It is based on three pillars or assumptions. First, non-nuclear weapon states commit not to acquire these weapons, so no new nuclear states. Second, nuclear weapon states commit to pursue good-faith negotiations on disarmament;

they never stop talking. The third is that all parties commit to supporting peaceful uses of nuclear technology.

We are a nuclear country. We have nuclear energy. We will continue to look at the importance of non-arm uses of nuclear power. Canada takes each of these pillars incredibly seriously. We are fully committed to the universal adoption and full implementation of the NPT. We continue to advocate for halting the spread of nuclear weapons, reducing existing stockpiles and ultimately eliminating them altogether. This work is not theoretical. It is practical. It is sustained. It is results-driven.

Under Canada’s G7 presidency this year, we convened the G7 Non-Proliferation Directors Group, driving forward nuclear transparency and risk reduction. At the recently concluded UN General Assembly First Committee, Canada urged member states to reject the notion that the geopolitical situation can ever justify slowing progress on nuclear disarmament. Canada has called for, instead, renewed urgency and tangible actions by all parties.

As the Prime Minister has said, we are living in an increasingly dangerous world. Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine, Iran’s nuclear non-compliance and the looming expiration, in February 2026, of the new START arms control treaty between the U.S. and Russia underscore the fragility of global norms, including the taboo against nuclear weapons use.

Canada’s response is twofold: We will increase defence spending to protect Canadians and our sovereignty, and we will double down on diplomacy to advance nuclear disarmament. For the last 30 years, we have been a leader at the UN on the fissile material cut-off treaty, which is a treaty that would ban the production of materials that are needed for nuclear weapons. These are foundational steps we will continue to take.

We recognize the sincere intentions behind the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. However, Canada’s view, as shared by our NATO allies, is that progress on nuclear disarmament must involve those who actually possess nuclear weapons; otherwise, it is talk.

As long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance. Our alliance is equally clear that the circumstances in which such weapons might ever be used are extremely remote. We will continue to stand with our partners around the world to reduce risk—

• (1835)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Adjournment Proceedings

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend, and he is my friend, for his remarks tonight.

I deeply hope that the Government of Canada will change its approach to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. As I said earlier, we led the way on the landmines treaty, yet we are standing aside. We may say our NATO allies are not signatories either, but they are observers. It is to our shame as Canadians that we do not even show up to observe and signal our support for the treaty.

It was a while ago that Albert Einstein said that the splitting of the atom changed everything except man's mode of thinking, "and we thus drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

We have been warned. A nuclear holocaust did not occur in the last part of this century through a combination of good luck and divine intervention. We cannot count on luck. We have to take action before a nuclear accident occurs or, worse, the deliberate use of nuclear weapons.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Mr. Speaker, this is where I get dangerous and ignore the remarks that have been given to me, and I simply thank the member.

It is well noted that many of our allies and friends are observers. It is well noted that the conversation must continue. Canada will continue to be a leader. We put our hopes and our aspirations and our work in the NPT, but conversations with everyone engaged is absolutely critical. I am very glad that parliamentarians have been part of those conversations.

I will take back the suggestion coming from the member. It is earnest. It is heartfelt. It is a smart idea that needs good consideration from our government.

• (1840)

EMPLOYMENT

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada faces an ongoing youth unemployment crisis. The youth unemployment rate is over 14%, which is more than a full point higher than where we were a year ago. According to the latest job numbers, more than 440,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 are unemployed. This continues to be a very bad situation for youth unemployment. Over 14% unemployment for young people is a bad number. It is not a good number, very clearly, and we need a strong response to address the youth unemployment crisis.

This is precisely why Conservatives put forward the Conservative youth jobs plan prior to the budget, calling on the government to take specific action to address the youth unemployment crisis. Our plan had four pillars: unleash the economy, fix immigration, fix training and build homes where the jobs are.

Unfortunately, budget 2025 not only fails to address this problem, but also contains specific provisions that would set us back. One of the things that I want to highlight tonight is how the Liberals completely broke their promises when it comes to the apprenticeship grant. Conservatives had proposed renewing it. Liberals had said they would renew it, and in fact they said they would expand it, yet there is no funding for that in the budget whatsoever.

Most apprentices study at polytechnics, and there would be no support for polytechnics in this budget. The budget actually goes further. On page 217 in the budget, the government is now proposing to completely withdraw any student grants in general from students who go to private institutions. The Liberals, in fact, would put more money into helping research councils help universities to attract foreign researchers to come to universities, but they would pull resources away from students who are attending career colleges. There would be nothing for polytechnics. There is a broken promise on the apprenticeship grant, and now the government would completely cut out of the system students who study at career colleges.

An important point to note is that there are many good vocations that students might pursue where overwhelmingly the only options are private institutions. If someone wants to study history or psychology, women's studies, law or medicine, then yes, they would most likely go to a public institution, but there are many other areas, such as those in trade skills and in specific professions. I talked earlier today about courses in the beauty industry and in alternative health, such as chiropractors and traditional Chinese medicine practitioners, where, overwhelmingly, people who are pursuing these disciplines go, and must go, to private institutions. That is their only option, yet in these areas, where there is labour demand and where people want to pursue these careers, the government would completely and arbitrarily shut out these students.

Our jobs plan actually called for a completely different approach. It called for support through students' grants to be aligned with the needs of the labour market. It called for having evaluations done of what the labour market needs are and to use student grants to magnify the needs of the labour market. Instead, the government would really deploy a kind of profession prejudice to shut students out, who are studying for these kinds of vocations at these kinds of institutions. It is discriminatory. It is not right, and it would risk exacerbating shortages in these professions, which would hurt our economy down the line.

Therefore, at a time of youth unemployment being very high, budget 2025 would make the situation worse by harming students, especially those in the trades and in other kinds of vocations that involve training outside of universities. Why would the government do this?

[*Translation*]

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan is concerned about the issue of employment, and indeed, the Canadian labour market is going through a period of disruption.

Adjournment Proceedings

A massive retirement wave is leading to a critical labour shortage. In fact, 300,000 skilled workers are expected to retire by 2033. This is a difficult situation, but the Government of Canada is committed to preparing the workforce for the future.

● (1845)

[English]

That is why budget 2025 has placed such an important emphasis on ensuring that young people have a future they can be proud of, a future and a career that they can rely on. Budget 2025 is proposing increased funding for the Canada summer jobs program to support 100,000 jobs across Canada in 2026. We are funding more jobs because the CSJ program has a proven track record of creating positive outcomes. It really does set young Canadians up for a lifetime of success in the job market. Last year, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada confirmed this by reporting that CSJ participants benefit in having better long-term earnings than non-participants do. Since 2019, CSJ has provided more than 530,000 young people with work, but that is just one program.

Budget 2025 also proposes over \$1.5 billion for the student work placement program and youth employment and skills strategy, which includes Canada summer jobs. This investment will support about 175,000 opportunities for youth in 2026-27 alone. That is next year. As well, ESDC's student work placement program has supported over 51,000 placements, so post-secondary students can develop work-ready skills. Three out of four employers reported a willingness to hire the students following their work placement.

Additionally, we have announced significant enhancements to Canada's job bank, which will more easily and quickly match Canadian workers, including youth, with available jobs. Our government takes youth employment seriously, because youth are the drivers of future economic growth. These programs are very successful at helping youth acquire in-demand skills and improve their employment prospects.

Above all, we believe Canada's future success depends on our trades workforce. Since the government is committed to doubling the pace of housing construction, Canada will need to hire thousands of new skilled tradespeople who can build these homes. Automotive service technicians, power line technicians, millwrights, horticulturalists, and truck and transport mechanics are also key to Canada's road to a prosperous future.

We are actively encouraging young people to consider developing trade careers that will help them and help the country. Each year, nearly \$1 billion goes toward apprenticeship supports and projects to help address challenges faced by apprentices as they pursue their Red Seal trade certification. Once they are trained, the just-passed One Canadian Economy Act will remove federal barriers to labour mobility, making it easier for skilled workers to do their job across Canada. A worker authorized in one jurisdiction can quickly and easily work in another.

The job of this government is to help create the workforce Canada needs to safeguard a strong economy. We are making sure that Canadian workers have the skills they need to succeed. We are taking action to make sure Canada comes out of this with a very deep pool of talent that will unlock a prosperous economic future

for Canada that all Canadians, but particularly young Canadians, can benefit from.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, the comments of the parliamentary secretary, in particular on skilled trades, are completely disconnected from the provisions in the budget that her government just put forward. She said some nice things about the skilled trades in her comments, and I agree with the nice things she said about the skilled trades. However, I am trying to square her professions of connection there with the fact that the government has broken its promise on the apprenticeship incentive grant and that it is cutting off student support to students who are studying at private career colleges.

I hope in this follow-up that I can get just a very direct answer from the parliamentary secretary. If she is sincere in the professions she has made about respecting and valuing skilled trade workers, could she explain very clearly why she supports a budget that broke the Liberals' promise on the apprenticeship incentive grant and that withdraws funding from students studying at career colleges?

Leslie Church: Mr. Speaker, do not take it from me; take it from Sean Strickland from Canada's Building Trades Unions, who commented on our budget. He stated, "The 2025 federal budget contains strong commitments to unionized labour and skilled tradespeople.

"It goes to show it's possible to create policies that are mutually beneficial when industry and government come to the table together....

"Strong labour conditions are the proven path to good jobs and world-class infrastructure, and as Canada enters a new era of nation-building projects, skilled trades workers will be at the forefront of this transformative time."

I think we can take it from actual members of Canadian trades that the measures we are putting into this budget, measures we drive as a government, are going to help tradespeople and young Canadians pursue the skilled trades in the years to come.

● (1850)

CARBON PRICING

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin with the words of one of my constituents. His name is David, and he is from Oliver, British Columbia. He says that pensioners on a low income are struggling with prices rising, especially food, which increases continually each month. There is only one increase a year for pensioners.

Adjournment Proceedings

David is right. Food costs are unaffordable and getting worse month after month. That is why I stand here tonight to request an explanation from the Liberal government about why it continues to hike the industrial carbon tax at a time when the cost of groceries for Canadians is only rising.

I know the member opposite will say there is no carbon tax on the food we pay for at the grocery store, but a tax on the supply chain, additional costly regulations and more red tape increase prices at every step, and at the end of the line, they increase the weekly grocery bill of families everywhere. It is simple economics.

When government changes regulations and adds costs, citizens where I live call that a tax. The industrial carbon tax is a tax on Canadian farms. How is it a tax on Canadian farms? It is a tax on the steel in farm equipment, in the storage bins and in tools. It is a tax on every grain dryer. It is a tax on every greenhouse heater on a farm. It is a tax on every bag of fertilizer. It is a tax on every aluminum can. It is a tax on every truck that hauls the food from the farm to the stores.

Just because the tax does not appear as a line item on a Safeway receipt, that does not mean it is not there. The government's taxes on sectors like steel and aluminum affect every person buying a can of soup. I will remind the Liberals that they have also raised the cost of food packaging with the P2 plastics ban, but that is not the subject of tonight's debate.

At a time of an illegal and unjustified U.S. trade war, when the Liberals promised to protect Canadian steel and aluminum producers, the Liberals are taxing them through the industrial carbon tax. The industrial carbon tax undermines the competitiveness of farms like the ones in the Okanagan Valley. Farmers in my riding compete with Washington state apple growers, who do not pay these additional taxes. It is wrong when a Washington state apple is more expensive in a grocery store than the Okanagan apple sitting right next to it that is grown down the street.

We all want to support Canadian jobs and businesses, so will the government commit to ending the industrial carbon tax on Canadian steel and aluminum to help bring down the price of food and the products we use every day?

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the beautiful riding of Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, a place I have visited many times over the years in my home province of British Columbia.

I want to address the member's question, which I believe is based on incorrect assumptions. Let me be very clear. There is no carbon tax applied to groceries. Farmers do not pay the industrial carbon price. The industrial carbon price system targets the largest producers in Canada, industrial facilities, not families and not the farmers who put food on our tables.

Canada's industrial carbon pricing systems are specifically designed to keep Canadian industrial industries competitive. For example, the federal backstop system gives companies flexibility. They can invest in cleaner processes or buy credits from innovators. Canada's pricing systems reduce emissions efficiently while protecting jobs and supporting economic growth.

The facts speak for themselves. Research by the Canadian Climate Institute published earlier this year concluded that large-emitter trading systems have zero or a positive impact on household consumption in 2025, and will have near zero by 2030. Because farmers do not pay the industrial carbon price, there are almost no costs to pass through the supply chain to consumers.

On the issue of food affordability, the independent analysis is clear. The real drivers of grocery price increases are global: supply chain disruptions, the war in Ukraine and energy price volatility. These are the pressures affecting Canadians. That is why the federal fuel charge was removed on April 1.

The opposition also refers to the clean fuel regulations, which they sometimes, or often, wrongly label as a hidden carbon tax. In reality, these regulations will cut up to 26 million tonnes of greenhouse gas pollution by 2030. They are supporting renewable diesel and hydrogen facilities in Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador, and renewable gas and green hydrogen projects in Ontario and Quebec. These projects create good jobs, strengthen local economies and position Canada as a clean energy leader.

The suggestion that repealing industrial carbon pricing or the clean fuel regulations would magically lower grocery prices is simply not grounded in fact. Eliminating climate policy does not make world oil prices drop, nor does it fix global supply chain pressures. What it would do is increase pollution and put Canadian jobs at real risk.

Climate action is economic action. Industrial carbon pricing reduces energy waste, drives innovation, attracts private investment and strengthens Canada's long-term competitiveness. Canadians deserve solutions based on facts, not slogans. Our approach protects jobs today while building a more resilient and prosperous economy for the next generation and generations to come.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1855)

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, what I do not understand is this. I appreciate the answer from the member across the way, but what I do not appreciate is the fact that if it costs me more as a farmer to do business, if it costs me more for steel and aluminum, why would I not raise my prices to cover those costs? That is the basis of running a business. One has to cover one's costs. If the cost of groceries is under global pressure, why have prices for groceries gone up so much more in Canada than in the United States?

What I did not hear were solutions on how we are going to lower the cost of groceries. The people who live in the Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay appreciate, and I think it is great, that the member has been there and knows how beautiful it is and how hard the people work. However, seniors, especially, and the most vulnerable Canadians cannot afford higher food costs. They do not want to wait in food lines anymore.

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate that there is no carbon tax on groceries and farmers do not pay the industrial carbon

price. Industrial carbon pricing and the clean fuel regulations are targeted tools that reduce pollution in a global market that is moving rapidly toward clean energy. Scrapping these measures would not lower grocery bills. It would weaken Canada's industrial base, deter investment and expose our businesses to higher costs under border tariffs from trading partners that are implementing their own carbon markets.

Our government will continue to develop policies that protect workers, strengthen competitiveness and build a secure, affordable future for all Canadians.

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

(The House adjourned at 6:58 p.m.)

Act of Bravery	
Fancy	3887
Charitable Giving in Bow River	
Bexte	3887
Organic Food Supply Chain	
Sgro	3888
Holodomor	
Bezan	3888
Courrier Laval	
Iacono	3888
Keith Thom	
Albas	3888
World Fisheries Day	
Klassen	3888
Public Safety	
Cody	3889
Jean-Paul Diamond	
Perron	3889
The Grenadiers	
Auguste	3889
Cost of Food	
Kirkland	3889
National Child Day	
Gould	3890
Taxation	
Rood	3890
Fisheries and Oceans	
MacDonald (Cardigan)	3890
Prime Minister of Canada	
Khanna	3890
Pancreatic Cancer	
Fragiskatos	3890

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade	
Scheer	3891
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3891
Natural Resources	
Scheer	3891
Hodgson	3891
Scheer	3891
Hodgson	3891
The Economy	
Paul-Hus	3891
LeBlanc	3892
Canada Revenue Agency	
Paul-Hus	3892

Lightbound	3892
Paul-Hus	3892
Lightbound	3892
Climate Change	
Normandin	3892
MacKinnon	3892
Normandin	3892
MacKinnon	3892
Bonin	3892
Dabrusin	3893
Finance	
Kusie	3893
MacKinnon	3893
Kusie	3893
MacKinnon	3893
Steinley	3893
Long	3893
Steinley	3893
Long	3893
Innovation, Science and Industry	
Seeback	3894
Bardeesy	3894
Seeback	3894
Bardeesy	3894
Canada Revenue Agency	
Deltell	3894
Lightbound	3894
Canadian Identity and Culture	
Champoux	3894
Guilbeault	3894
Champoux	3894
Guilbeault	3895
The Economy	
Berthold	3895
Lightbound	3895
Berthold	3895
Lightbound	3895
Hardy	3895
Provost	3895
Lawton	3895
Church	3896
Lawton	3896
Church	3896
Public Safety	
Sodhi	3896
Anandasangaree	3896
National Defence	
Bezan	3896
McGuinty	3897
Bezan	3897
McGuinty	3897
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Rempel Garner	3897

Fragiskatos	3897
Rempel Garner	3897
Fragiskatos	3897
Democratic Institutions	
Chong	3897
Anandasangaree	3897
Chong	3898
Anandasangaree	3898
Public Safety	
Vis	3898
Anandasangaree	3898
Guglielmin	3898
MacKinnon	3898
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	3898
Anandasangaree	3898
Infrastructure	
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	3898
Guilbeault	3899
International Trade	
Davidson	3899
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3899
Davidson	3899
Solomon	3899
Bexte	3899
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3899
Sport	
Nguyen	3899
van Koeverden	3900
International Trade	
Davies (Niagara South)	3900
MacKinnon	3900
Foreign Affairs	
Boulerice	3900
Fortier	3900
Indigenous Affairs	
Idlout	3900
Gull-Masty	3901
Business of the House	
Scheer	3901
Kayabaga	3901

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Second reading	3901
Nguyen	3901
Caputo	3903
Larouche	3903
Danko	3904
Van Popta	3904
Lamoureux	3906
DeBellefeuille	3906
Wagantall	3906

Godin	3906
Special Joint Committee on the Building Canada Act	
Lamoureux	3907
Motion	3907
(Motion agreed to)	3908
Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Second reading	3908
Deschênes	3908
Iacono	3908
Dalton	3908
Sarai	3909
Gill (Windsor West)	3910
Bonin	3910
Lamoureux	3910
Wagantall	3911
St-Pierre	3911
Deltell	3912
Bonin	3913
Fanjoy	3913
Deltell	3913
Danko	3915
Larouche	3915
Cody	3915
Kram	3915
Guay	3917
Deschênes	3917
Kibble	3917
Gasparro	3917
Van Popta	3919
Larouche	3919
Danko	3919
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	3919
Kibble	3920
Deschênes	3920
Danko	3921

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Living Donor Recognition Medal Act	
Abouttaif	3921
Bill C-234. Second reading	3921
St-Pierre	3923
Larouche	3923
Généreux	3923
Petitpas Taylor	3924
Larouche	3925
Konanz	3926
Fancy	3928
DeBellefeuille	3929

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs	
May	3929
Oliphant	3930

Employment

Genuis	3931
Church	3931

Carbon Pricing

Konanz	3932
Grant	3933

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>