



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 059  
Monday, November 24, 2025

---

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 24, 2025

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1100)

[*English*]

### CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The House resumed from October 22 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to the motion from my colleague and friend. The member for York South—Weston—Etobicoke has introduced a substantial motion that all of us should get behind. The experience he brings to the table as a former minister who has dealt with the issue first-hand and who has had the opportunity to experience the benefits of Canada's contribution to foreign aid speaks volumes.

I would like to reflect a bit on a couple of things. One is the important role that Canada plays as a G7 country. Much like other G7 countries, we have a leadership role to play in the world in how we can make the world a better place in which to live. Canada has a moral and, I would ultimately argue, legal obligation to financially support other areas of the world.

Through our aid, we have been very generous over the years, and we have been effective with the dollars we contribute. There is a high sense of accountability, and we have to look at ways to do this in a smart fashion, in a strategic and innovative way, so we can contribute to the betterment of other countries and their development. The motion we have before us highlights three ways in which we can do that.

We can talk about how important it is for us to integrate opportunities for reciprocal economic benefits where we provide some form of assistance to small and medium-sized businesses and non-profits so they are able to benefit from the foreign aid that has been provided. I am going to use the Philippines in a couple of examples.

Not that long ago, I was in the Philippines with the former minister of agriculture. People may be surprised to know that Canada

leads the world in potato production in many ways, with good-quality potatoes. Our expertise and technology were being used in the Philippines, where we saw potatoes being produced from seeds from Prince Edward Island. Those potato seeds ultimately increased the production of potatoes in the Philippines. I would ultimately argue that there are many different ways in which we can contribute and that there is a great benefit not only to the people who receive assistance, but also to Canada.

Just recently, the Secretary of State for International Development came back from the Philippines. There was a commitment of multiple millions of dollars to support 12 different types of projects in the Philippines. The Red Cross has been supported to help support the Philippines in dealing with climate disasters, as have the areas in which we promote economic development for a more stable community. That project, as I recall, is from a few years ago, and we provided, I believe, \$1 million. That provided an educational program to promote peace and tolerance, human rights and anti-racism in the Mindanao area of the country to ensure there is more tolerance, if I can put it that way. We saw a substantial decrease in racist behaviour, or more tolerance among children. The program affected thousands of students and the hundreds of teachers who provided the programming, and that was with \$1 million.

• (1105)

When we take a look at the overall numbers, we find that through a relatively small investment, Canada can have a profoundly positive impact in the country where we made that investment. When I say small investments versus large impact, I am talking about, for a few million dollars, impacting literally millions and millions of children in particular. That is where my interest is when I think of foreign investment to support international assistance. It is how we help children and women in particular in our society. I take great pride in the manner in which Canada, in many ways, leads the world on that as a G7 country.

Going back to the Philippines, I would suggest, using a tangible example that comes out of the motion, that Canada has a long history with the Philippines of supporting initiatives to support the people of the Philippines. Earlier this year, five or six weeks ago, the Prime Minister was in Malaysia, where he met with President Marcos. They had a wonderful discussion, which ultimately led to a commitment to trying to get a free trade agreement between Canada and the Philippines in 2026.

*Private Members' Business*

When I have had discussions with members of Congress from the Philippines in the past, or just with individuals in general from the business community and others, they often talk about the special relationship between the two countries. Canada cares about what is taking place in the Philippines, and as a direct result, this has had an impact, as the Philippines has elevated its middle class, which has grown expeditiously over the last number of years. Its GDP continues to increase. Its place in Asia continues to grow. Because of Canada's relationship with the Philippines over the last number of years, not only have we been able to help many people in the Philippines, but we are now seeing the dividends here in Canada.

I think of the former minister and the efforts that he put toward the continent of Africa and toward the many countries to which we have contributed international development assistance over the years, covering a wide area of support, with emphasis on children, hunger, education, women, human rights and climate change. These are the types of values that we often tie to our foreign assistance. I believe that builds a healthier and stronger relationship.

When we take a look at the motion that has been brought forward by my friend from York South—Weston—Etobicoke, we see the three points that are amplified: integrating reciprocal economic opportunities for small businesses, non-profits and the like so there is a benefit for Canadians; having a dedicated economic partnership window, especially for larger projects, which I suspect will make a huge difference; and ultimately having a report to Parliament on an annual basis dealing with outcomes, ensuring more accountability.

These are the types of things with which we can build more public confidence within Canada and that show why it is so important that we continue to support international development and aid. Here at home, at times there can be resistance to it. If we provide a sense of accountability and explain to Canadians why it is so important that Canada plays this role, I believe it will be better received all round.

I believe we have a moral obligation to continue on the path that we started many years ago. I appreciate that this motion was brought forward by my colleague.

• (1110)

**Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to discuss this important motion from the member for York South—Weston—Etobicoke.

I will start by commending the member. We get one shot to move a motion or a private member's bill if we are lucky to be drawn early enough to have it debated in the House. It can be tempting to put something forth that is partisan and that makes it difficult for other parties to support, but as I read this motion, I think the member used his opportunity to move something that can bring the House together. I thank him for that.

There are some particular things I would like to note. As I mentioned, the language is drawn to find consensus in the House. On the language around accountability and effectiveness, I think back to what got me interested in international development in the first place, which was the Muskoka initiative back in 2010, when the Harper government of the day was hosting the G8 and had the opportunity

to have a signature initiative. Stakeholders like Save the Children, UNICEF, CARE, World Vision and others came together and had the idea of tackling two particular targets that were behind: the target to save the lives of kids under five, and the target to save the lives of mothers in and around childbirth. Of course, those were things that all Canadians could support when they really understood what was going on.

One thing that was hard-wired into the Muskoka initiative was the steps around accountability and transparency. On the accountability side, one thing that was hard-wired in was that when G8 countries came to Canada and made a promise on the Muskoka initiative, they were expected to keep that promise. Second to that, on the transparency piece, was working with the international community. In fact, Prime Minister Harper co-chaired a group that was focused on making sure that we knew where the money was going, that there was some transparency around where the money was being spent and that the money was being spent to accomplish the goals that it set out. I remember talking to the CEO of one of the international development organizations in Canada who said the Muskoka initiative was probably one of two G7 or G8 initiatives that had a meaningful impact. Probably the most powerful two were the Make Poverty History campaign and the Muskoka initiative.

It is important with these types of initiatives, when we are talking about accountability and transparency, to focus on the outcomes. When we look at the outcomes, we can look at the two millennium development goals, or MDGs, which were set out in 2000 with a timeline to finish them by 2015: MDG 4 and MDG 5 around saving the lives of kids and saving the lives of mothers. In 2000, nine million kids were dying every year from things that nobody in North America would die from, like diarrhea, things that were completely preventable. We were way behind on our targets, but by 2015, in large part because of efforts that Canadians led, we went from nine million kids under five dying to under six million kids under five dying every year from completely preventable causes. The momentum really picked up after the Muskoka initiative.

In the area of moms dying in and around childbirth, in 2000, the number of moms dying every year in and around childbirth around the world, again from completely preventable causes, was 500,000. By 2015, in large part due to the efforts of all countries, but organized through the Muskoka initiative led by Canada, we went from 500,000 moms dying every year to under 300,000 moms dying. There are over 200,000 more mothers living every single year in part because Canada marshalled support from the international community to support the Muskoka initiative.

• (1115)

With respect to these types of impacts, I have seen the birthing kits that organizations use and that they handed out on the ground; organizations like World Vision, Plan International, Save the Children, CARE and UNICEF have been a big part of that. In those birthing kits might be something like a plastic sheet to lay on a dirt floor so a mom can give birth on the sheet instead of on a dirt floor, or an X-acto knife, a box cutter-type knife, to cut the umbilical cord. Again, it would probably take pennies to produce those, and someone would not have to chew the umbilical cord to break it when a baby is born.

I am not allowed to use props, but if I were, I would hold up a little bottle like an eye drop bottle for people with contact lenses, which holds a clean saline-type solution that could be put on the end of the umbilical cord to keep a baby alive. In the absence of that, oftentimes folks in some parts of the world would put mud on the end of the umbilical cord as a way to seal it off. Members can imagine the impact that would have. Birthing kits were, for pennies, saving people's lives, women's lives and the lives of kids, and having a huge impact around the world.

I do not often stand here in support of a Liberal member's motion or bill, but one of the reasons I am standing here in support of this particular one is that it is designed to bring us together and to find some common ground. One of the key things from Muskoka at the time was that the organizations that came together ahead of time to work with the government and the Prime Minister's Office were really focused on finding the things that 95% of Canadians probably could support at that time. They set aside some things that may have been more wedge issues, to really focus on something that brought people together. That had an enormous impact.

However, we are in a different time than we were in then. When we consider the challenging budget situation we have right now, there are a few reasons why it is hard to get Canadians to bring up, at their doorsteps, international development. I think number one is addressed in the bill; I think there is a feeling that there is no accountability for the money being spent. I think there is a feeling that the money being spent is not effective. As well, I think there is a feeling that the money is going into the pockets of folks who are not spending it the way it is supposed to be spent, and there is a lack of transparency around it. I think the motion seeks to deal with some of those things.

I also think that sometimes the language that gets used is sort of inner circle language or echo chamber language that Canadians have a hard time understanding. I will not get into the terminology. I have had lots of conversations about the terminology with people who work in the sector, but if I talk to my constituents in my incredible riding of Leduc—Wetaskiwin and use the language that the international development world uses, they do not really know what I am talking about.

However, I noticed that the first part of the motion talks about reciprocal economic benefit, about harnessing Canadian innovators and small business and about Canadian economic strengths around clean energy, agriculture, digital tech and education. If I talk to my constituents about harnessing Alberta expertise in agriculture so we can deal with the food crisis around the world, it is easy to get them on board. If I talk about Albertans' expertise in drilling and energy, which is probably the most dedicated to being as clean as we can be in terms of energy production, and if I talk about harnessing that expertise to work with countries that have energy resources that are not being used to their economic benefit, I think I can win my constituents over on those conversations.

Edmonton is a centre for AI through AMII, the Alberta Machine Intelligence Institute. If we talk about harnessing that expertise and putting it to work, working in partnership with people around the world who have the expertise though maybe not quite the same resources, that is a conversation that is really easy to have with my

### *Private Members' Business*

constituents if we just speak in the language that those constituents are using.

I will just close by again thanking the hon. member for moving the motion. I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate.

● (1120)

[*Translation*]

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not start my speech by wishing a very happy birthday to my dear colleague from Laurentides—Labbelle, who is kicking off her 50th year with her usual poise.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to this motion, which proposes a new international assistance framework in Canada. The Bloc Québécois supports the spirit of this motion, but, as is often the case in the House, it also believes that the motion can and should be improved. That is why we moved an amendment, which is essential for making this motion fair, balanced and representative of the realities in Quebec and in small communities in Canada.

I want to thank my Bloc colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean for presenting his amendment. His work reflects our party's long-standing commitment to regional equity and the leadership that Quebec organizations have shown in international co-operation for decades. This amendment is not symbolic; it addresses a very real and persistent problem.

Too often, federal programs focus their funding on large urban centres, ignoring the expertise found in remote regions like Abitibi-Témiscamingue, the north shore, Quebec's northern regions, Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, the Lower St. Lawrence, the Gaspé region, the Magdalen Islands and other communities, such as Mont-Laurier. Small international co-operation centres, many of which have been established in their communities since the 1970s and 1980s, play a key role. They promote sustainable, community-based development abroad and maintain strong and lasting partnerships. However, they are often sidelined when federal funding is distributed, not because they lack expertise but because they are not close to Ottawa or to the major centralized networks.

Our amendment seeks to correct this imbalance by ensuring that non-profit organizations and small co-operation centres located outside major urban areas have the same opportunities for federal funding as larger organizations. It is about fairness as well as results. These regional organizations carry out high-impact and high-transparency projects abroad and deserve to be included in the system.

*Private Members' Business*

I would like to highlight the work of the Centre de solidarité internationale Corcovado, located in my riding of Rouyn-Noranda. It is a perfect example of what I have been talking about. This organization has been supporting international co-operation projects for over 40 years. Its mission is simple but essential: to help develop projects abroad, raise awareness of global solidarity and promote responsible consumption here at home. Since 1984, Corcovado has had deep roots in Abitibi—Témiscamingue, where it works to improve living conditions and build a better future for communities in Latin America, Africa, the Caribbean and Asia. It maintains long-standing partnerships based on trust and genuine community engagement.

However, despite their history and the quality of their work, organizations like Corcovado still struggle to access federal funding because they operate outside major urban centres. Corcovado has to fund its mission by operating a bookstore, where it sells donated books at affordable prices. International aid can also support development abroad while bolstering the economies of different countries. When it is done responsibly, both sides benefit.

Let me give another concrete example. Let us say that Canada is providing assistance to a partner country in South America for the construction of a hydroelectric dam. Instead of paying the entire amount to companies located abroad, Canada could use part of this assistance to enlist the expertise of Hydro-Québec or any Quebec company operating in this sector. The partner country would receive sustainable infrastructure and Canada would be investing in a climate-friendly project. Quebec companies would be contributing their world-class expertise in hydroelectricity. This kind of co-operation would create real value for both parties.

We have already seen how the expertise available in our region of Abitibi—Témiscamingue can change things abroad. When two miners were trapped underground in the Dominican Republic back in 2022, it was Machines Roger International, a Val-d'Or company, that provided the drilling equipment needed for the rescue operation. These machines were flown in by the Canadian Forces and used on site to reach the workers. People back home followed the story closely and with immense pride. This shows that a company from our region that is not a huge multinational is capable of responding and helping save lives.

Small and medium-sized businesses already have the expertise needed to contribute internationally, and they are being contacted directly. What they need is a federal system that does not put obstacles in the way.

• (1125)

Even in its own national calls for tenders, Ottawa designs processes that exclude SMEs by default because the administrative burdens and eligibility requirements are tailored to large institutions and urban centres. If the government really wants small players to be included in international aid, it needs to start by simplifying its own processes. This is another reason why the Bloc Québécois amendment is so important. It ensures that the motion's intentions translate into real access for organizations in the regions.

We also see this international commitment in our academic institutions. The Université du Québec en Abitibi—Témiscamingue, or UQAT, offers a master's degree and a graduate diploma in global

health, and the Abitibi—Témiscamingue CEGEP has long offered international internships, giving students the opportunity to work in health, global development and community development programs abroad. This is in addition to the many high schools in the region that also participate in exchange programs and solidarity initiatives.

I would like to recognize the remarkable work of people in our region who have made history in this field. I am thinking, for example, of former professor Mario Brulé and current professor Johanne Toupin from UQAT, who co-founded Nurses Without Borders. Over the years, they have made it possible for nursing students from our region to participate in internships in Africa and South America, experiences that shaped their careers and connected Abitibi—Témiscamingue to the rest of the world in a very real way. Thanks to their leadership, many young people from Abitibi—Témiscamingue have had the opportunity to participate in projects that have helped them expand their skill set and deepen their understanding of global health issues. I sincerely thank them for their commitment.

The second section of the motion calls for the creation of a new dedicated economic partnerships window for projects that align poverty reduction with Canada's economic security. Again, this is not an idea we are opposed to. A dedicated tool or portal could help to streamline project development.

However, we cannot ignore Ottawa's track record. Every time the federal government announces a new administrative system, it ends up outsourcing the design to an external consultant, often at an eye-watering cost. The COVID Alert app, the ArriveCAN app, the Phoenix pay system, and the Canada Border Services Agency's assessment and revenue management system are just a few examples. All were supposed to simplify federal operations, but all turned into costly failures.

Let us be very clear on this point. The federal public service already has the necessary staff and expertise to design its programs and manage its tools. Our public servants know their stuff. They understand how international assistance works. They do not need to farm this work out to some big consulting firm. We are going to be watching. If a new portal is created, it must be simple, transparent and affordable. It must not morph into another multimillion-dollar contract that gets awarded to international consultants instead of being developed within the government, where it belongs.

The third element of the motion is the one the Bloc Québécois supports most strongly, requiring the Minister of International Development to report to Parliament annually on the effectiveness of our international assistance and how it benefits Canada. In 2023, the Auditor General brought to light an utter failure at Global Affairs Canada, when the minister was unable to demonstrate how the department's \$3.5 billion in annual development funding had improved the lives of women and girls under Canada's feminist international assistance policies.

*Private Members' Business*

Even more worrying is the fact that only half of the projects funded were in fact reported to Parliament. Canadians cannot effectively evaluate our international assistance initiatives if the government itself does not have any information. Annual reports would strengthen transparency and restore trust, and would enable Parliament to properly assess the impact of Canadian projects abroad.

The Bloc Québécois continues to support the international objective of investing 0.7% of gross national income in official development assistance. This objective was set by the United Nations in 1970. More than half a century later, Canada still has no plan to achieve it. Its focus is on the short term only.

Climate change, conflicts and forced displacements all reach our borders eventually. Investing in prevention abroad means fewer humanitarian crises. Development assistance policies are not just charity, they represent foresight. International assistance also contributes to relieving the pressures that drive populations to leave their home. When we support local economies, we help small businesses get off the ground and we strengthen education systems.

• (1130)

[*English*]

**Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House to speak on behalf of the incredible citizens of Calgary Midnapore, who I am so incredibly proud to represent.

Motion No. 14 is, of course, regarding Canada's international development assistance. As I am a former diplomat for Canada, this is of special interest to me. I have had the opportunity to serve abroad and to be just a small part of the implementation of Canadian development programming. Coming from this diplomatic background, I have had a bit of time to experience this and to consider my thoughts on the reasoning for foreign aid and the reasoning for international development.

For me, it is primarily two things. The first thing is the hope that all of humanity could have the incredible historic standard of living we had in Canada, which is something absolutely wonderful. The second reason is that we, as a nation, could be investing against future problems for Canada. I think these are both very solid reasons and considerations for foreign aid. I will expand on each of these ideas.

The first one, as I said, is the hope that all of humanity could have the incredible historic standard of living we had in Canada. I would go so far to say, as a developed democratic nation, it is our obligation to help other nations on the road to democracy. Nothing feels better than helping other people. I know my colleagues in the House would most certainly agree with that since we get the opportunity to do this as members of Parliament.

When I was consul and chargé for Canada in El Salvador, I really enjoyed implementing the Canada fund. This was at a very special time in the history of El Salvador, certainly not the El Salvador we see now under Bukele, but a time where there was still much insecurity and instability within El Salvador. Our funding through the Canada fund was for children's organized sports. This gave me a lot of joy because I knew that, with Canada investing in this, we were

investing in the security and the safety of Salvadorans and of the nation of El Salvador.

To be raised in Calgary Midnapore is to have the best standard of living in the world. Calgary is consistently ranked as one of the world's most livable cities, and Midnapore itself was recently ranked as the third-best community in the city of Calgary. My favourite thing about this is that citizens of Calgary Midnapore have historically recognized that energy is the reason we have had this amazing standard of living. It is the reason I got to swim in Lake Bonavista every summer with my school friends and then skate on it in the winter. As I said, this was until recently. Things have changed in Canada, and they do not allow for the standard of living we once had.

These are some of those things. Canada has fallen to 27th place in the global quality of life index, dropping from ninth place, where it was a decade ago. It is the largest decline among the world's top 30 countries. There were 2.2 million visits to food banks in March 2025, the highest number in Canadian history, and 700,000 of those food bank visitors were children. Food bank usage has doubled since March 2019. GDP per person has decreased by 2% from 2020 to 2024, the worst five-year decline since the Great Depression. Things are not what they were once upon a time in Canada, but my hope is that all citizens of the world would experience the standard of living that we once had in Canada.

My second major thought about the purpose of foreign aid and international development is that aid is an investment against future problems Canada might possibly incur. I will expand upon this. I am always stunned by the short-sightedness of those who do not understand this. Strong nations can trade with Canada. Once again, when I was the consul and chargé for Canada in El Salvador, I worked on the CA4 agreement, which I believe ended up just being between Canada and Honduras. Nonetheless, I had the opportunity to work on that and present that to the Salvadoran government at the time.

As well, there is former prime minister Harper's incredible work in the Asia-Pacific. Our side has always recognized that more trade means more prosperity for Canada.

• (1135)

Having strong nations means that people will not be displaced, that they can live and thrive in their homelands, and that there is not the necessity for other developed nations to absorb these people because they have been given the opportunity to succeed as a result of foreign aid. Having strong nations means that there are fewer wars and that we do not have to send our sons and daughters into conflict. The thought of my son going off to war keeps me awake at night. I pray for every parent who has to send their son or daughter into conflict.

*Private Members' Business*

Foreign aid promotes stability. However, if we are going to do international development, we have to do it right. For me, this means three things. Number one, it should align with our shared values. Former prime minister Stephen Harper did this perfectly, as opposed to the other side, from which we just saw this conflict this weekend when the Prime Minister said that upholding Canadian values will occur but dropped talk of feminist foreign policy, yet the women and gender equality minister is still working to make sure that Ottawa is tackling gender-based violence. Which is it? Is it one or the other?

Former prime minister Stephen Harper had a crystal clear vision for foreign policy. I will give three examples. The first one is the Muskoka initiative, which went on to significantly decrease mortality for those under the age of five. I had the opportunity to experience this on an incredible trip to Kenya with Results Canada. I want to thank them again for that. I had the opportunity to see, first-hand, mothers and children thriving. I had an opportunity to see these incredible facilities that exist as a result of former prime minister Stephen Harper's vision.

Another example I will give is that of the Americas strategy. When I worked as policy adviser for former minister Kent at that time, these principles were firmly founded upon democracy, justice and prosperity. Do members know what else I really liked about the Americas strategy? No money was given to dictators. No money was given to terrorist organizations, something that the government has a serious problem with. There was no money for Cuba and there was no money for Venezuela. There was only money to promote democracy abroad.

Finally, my third example is the monitoring of elections in Ukraine—

**An hon. member:** Scheer is half American.

**Stephanie Kusie:** Madam Speaker, I am hearing from the other side that the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle is American. The Prime Minister himself actually has three passports: United Kingdom, Ireland and Canada. It is very interesting that they would bring this up. If we are going to talk about that, the Prime Minister has three passports. As I said, his loyalty is not to Canada, and the government cannot seem to get over this.

We need serious oversight of the \$8.4 billion in foreign aid. We need the Secretary of State for International Development to come and report to the House, because we have a \$70-billion deficit, \$50 billion of interest on the debt and \$414 billion in expenditures this year alone. This is a government that really requires oversight in its expenditures. If we are going to do this foreign aid, this international development, as I have mentioned, we absolutely need the oversight.

Finally, with regard to economic partnership, if Canada can benefit from these disbursements, then why not? We should actually be doing things that help the Canadian economy as well. Canada has an incredible non-profit sector. I pointed to Results Canada as one example. If we can benefit Canadian prosperity, then we should be doing that as well.

In conclusion, we should be supporting the motion. I remind the government of the greatest gift that we could possibly have given it,

and that is Bill C-5. Bill C-5 is a free pass to create incredible prosperity for Canadians, which we need at this time, given the incredible numbers concerning debt, deficit and expenditure I have shared.

I will point out that, since taking office in 2015, the Liberals have never once delivered a surplus. The Parliamentary Budget Officer said that their new operational versus capital spending framework does not actually provide an operational surplus in 2028-29 as the government projected in budget 2025. Instead, it is an \$18-billion deficit. If we are able to get to a place of prosperity, this prosperity—

● (1140)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Prince Albert.

**Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to get up this morning to talk about this motion. I can get behind it because there are lots of common-sense things within the motion.

Who would not want to “strengthen the accountability, effectiveness, and mutual benefits of Canada's international development assistance”? I think that is common sense. I think everybody would get behind that. We always want to do things better. We want to deliver programs more efficiently. If we can do that more effectively with more accountability in the process, then that is a good thing. I think that is proper.

The motion states it would do this by “implementing new policies to ensure that Canadian international assistance programming integrates opportunities for reciprocal economic benefit, including through the participation of Canadian small and medium-sized enterprises, innovators, and workers”. Why would we not want to include our SMEs in this process? They have so much to offer. They have so much to contribute in foreign aid.

Foreign aid does actually give us soft power. It creates a Canadian environment in different countries around the world, and that is a positive environment. Our businesses that export in these regions do it with integrity and honour. Why would we not include them in foreign aid? I think that is a good way for them to participate. If there is a little economic benefit for them, there is nothing wrong with that. I think that is a positive thing.

The motion would do this by “establishing a dedicated Economic Partnerships Window to support projects that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home, and that utilize Canadian economic strengths such as clean energy, agriculture, digital technology, and education”. Again, these types of things make sense. We have lots of knowledge in all these areas.

*Private Members' Business*

When I think of agriculture in my province of Saskatchewan, I think that part of our foreign aid could be teaching farmers around the world how to use things that conserve soil and conserve fertilizer. When I look at the province of Saskatchewan, the potash, I see that we have things that can help increase yields, allow people to be self-sufficient and provide food security.

On digital technology and education, Canada is becoming a leader in that, and it will be a leader in that. Why would we not help other countries around the world in developing those types of technologies? Why would they not come to Canada? Canada is a great place for AI work. It is a great place to store data. A lot of people do not want to store their data in China or the U.S.

Why not store it in Canada? There is a natural advantage. Of course, these storage facilities take a lot of power to cool. It just so happens, where I live in Saskatchewan, it is cold six months out of the year, so we do not need nearly as much power to cool that data and keep it in place. Again, that is a common-sense approach where Canada could really help people around the world.

The motion would do this by “requiring the Minister of International Development to report to Parliament annually on the extent of Canadian participation in international assistance projects, the measurable benefits for partner countries, and the economic opportunities created for Canadians”. Again, that is part of the accountability.

I do not want to see this become something where there is red tape, where it gets over-regulated and becomes a cumbersome process. To come back to a committee to show what was done this year, show the benchmarks for next year, give a five-year goal and show that the 10-year goal can be flexible and change would be very proper and proactive management of our foreign aid and how we distribute our foreign aid.

Canada should have a common, consistent approach around the world. We need the commonality where we stand up for the values we strongly believe in and show those values around the world through foreign aid and through the way we conduct ourselves in the business community. I think that is something Canada could really do well in, and I think it would be appreciated by countries all over the world.

The Canadian flag still means something. I wear it proudly whenever I go abroad, and people often tap me on the shoulder to ask where I am from in Canada, because a lot of people have friends and relatives who live here in Canada. There are things we have done right in the past, which has created a country that is respected around the world. If we do foreign aid properly, we can maintain that respect, be more efficient and more effective, build that soft power and have that influence to make the world a better place.

This motion has some good ideas, and I can see the Conservative Party getting strongly behind it.

• (1145)

**Hon. Ahmed Hussen (York South—Weston—Etobicoke, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Motion No. 14 embodies the simple but powerful idea that Canada's generosity abroad should also help build opportunity at home. That is what it is about. For decades, we

have seen Canadians lead with compassion, building schools, strengthening ecosystems and food systems, empowering women and saving lives right around the world. We have done so not because of recognition but because it is simply who we are. However, as the world changes, our development approach must change with it. We can continue to be generous, but we must also be strategic, accountable and mutually beneficial. That is what Motion No. 14 is all about. It aims to make international assistance more accountable, effective and results-driven. It aligns with ongoing efforts to strengthen transparency and ensures that development investments deliver measurable impacts to those who need them.

The motion underlines the link between global development and Canada's own prosperity. Stable, self-reliant partners with strong institutions and the rule of law contribute to a safer, more predictable world, benefit Canadians and support long-term economic security for all of us. By proposing to support the greater involvement of Canadian small and medium-sized enterprises, and innovators and workers in international development, Motion No. 14 highlights how Canada can maximize global impact while also creating jobs, fostering innovation and building expertise right here at home. The motion encourages innovative projects that leverage our unique strengths, such as clean energy, digital technology, education and health, while maintaining a clear focus on poverty reduction and inclusive economic growth. By fostering collaboration among development partners, local actors and the private sector, the motion would promote sustainable outcomes that align with both Canada's international commitments and its domestic economic and social priorities.

Our government has presented a budget of generational investments to empower Canadians, strengthen our economy and secure a stronger, more resilient future for our country. We are living through a time of global change. This means that we must act decisively to ensure that we lay the groundwork for long-term strength and prosperity for our people. Across government, that means making disciplined and sometimes difficult decisions to keep our spending targeted and to make sure that every dollar delivers results, impacts and help for people. As we refocus our international footprint, we remain firmly committed to international assistance and delivering help where it is needed, so the motion is actually in line with the aims of the budget as well.

*Government Orders*

I have seen first-hand how Canada's international development partnerships change lives, from access to education to providing clean water and enabling people to pursue entrepreneurship and find hope in their lives. Motion No. 14 builds on that proud tradition and propels it into the future. It would ensure that aid remains generous, effective and accountable while also being smart, strategic and sustainable.

When we help others rise, we rise with them. Let us pass Motion No. 14 and make Canada's international development policy a model of shared progress for a changing world.

• (1150)

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** The question is on the amendment.

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

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I would suggest we pass it on division.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** The next question is on the main motion, as amended.

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

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, again, we would ask that it pass on division.

(Motion agreed to)

SITTING SUSPENDED

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** The House will now suspend for seven minutes.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:53 a.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.)

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1200)

[*English*]

### BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed from November 21 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.

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the budget implementation act would allow us to put into action budget 2025, which is a budget built for the moment in which we find ourselves.

Much has been said about this moment, but it is worth recapping. Our largest trade partner and the world's largest economy has turned its back on free trade; global conflicts are on the rise, and, of course, the world is now dealing with the effects of climate change, which are dangerous effects that will only grow over time and that threaten prosperity, lives and the well-being of this planet. It is this context that budget 2025 meets.

I have said elsewhere, and I will say again, that this is an economist's budget in the very best sense. It methodically addresses the challenges in front of us. It asks and provides answers to three questions: What are we trying to do? What do we have available? What course will get us there?

First, what are we trying to do? We are trying to increase productivity. That is how we make sure our economy grows and wages rise. We are trying to make life more affordable, especially housing, and we are giving ourselves the tools to chart our own course in an increasingly dangerous world. We must do that while staying true to Canadian values by protecting our environment, advancing reconciliation and making sure that everybody can access opportunity.

What do we have available? We have resources, both natural and human. We also have the fiscal strength to invest in our own success. The opposition likes to talk about government finances using the language of credit cards to suggest that any investment is reckless, any borrowing irresponsible and any ambition unaffordable, but Canadians know better. Every family that has ever bought a home knows better. Every entrepreneur who has ever grown a business knows better. It would be foolish to put a house on a credit card, but it is not foolish to take out a mortgage to own one. Households thrive through smart borrowing; companies grow through smart debt, and opportunities vanish when we insist on waiting until we have the cash on hand.

Budget 2025 shifts government borrowing from spending on operations to investments in capital and productivity, and that distinction matters. The reality is this: Canada is one of the wealthiest countries in the world. We enjoy the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and one of the lowest deficit-to-GDPs, and we are recognized internationally for the strength of our fiscal framework and our ability to invest ambitiously while protecting our long-term sustainability.

Kristalina Georgieva, the managing director of the IMF, recently said that Canada stands out in the G7: “the Canadian authorities have been very decisive to take action” by separating operating spending from investment and focusing strategically on pro-growth investments in such areas as housing, infrastructure and energy.

That brings us to the course that budget 2025 sets. We are making historic investments in productivity, housing, defence and infrastructure. The budget commits \$280 billion over five years. On a cash basis, it represents \$450 billion, which is almost half a trillion dollars of investment in the foundations that support our country. The budget implementation act would tackle productivity head-on through the productivity superdeduction, enhancements to SR&ED, investments in advanced research and researchers, financial sector modernization and targeted incentives for major nation-building projects that will expand our economic capacity. Budget 2025 also introduces an expanded suite of investment tax credits. These are instruments designed to crowd in private capital.

The budget makes generational investments in housing by committing \$25 billion over five years, including the creation of Build Canada Homes, eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers up to \$1 million and mainstreaming advanced construction methods that can cut building timelines by up to 50%.

The budget makes generational investments in defence by providing \$30 billion over five years to rebuild and rearm the Canadian Armed Forces; meeting NATO's 2% target this year, climbing from a low of under 1% in 2014 under Prime Minister Harper; and launching a new defence industry strategy and defence investment agency.

The budget makes generational investments in infrastructure by providing \$115 billion over five years for core public infrastructure, trade and transportation corridors, and indigenous and municipal infrastructure and investments to accelerate clean power, ports and economic corridors across the country.

The budget helps families directly, with tax cuts and programs that make life more affordable and jobs more available while preserving the services people count on. It also preserves essential climate action. As the Prime Minister reiterated in the House last week, we remain committed to our Paris goals and net zero 2050. It does this in a simplified way by focusing on the tools that have the biggest impact on emissions, that have the smallest impact on day-to-day life and that are most likely to support and build the clean-technology industries that already capture two out of every three dollars invested in energy globally.

● (1205)

The government's new carbon competitiveness framework, which is outlined in the budget and would be made real by this budget implementation act, has many effective tools to reduce emissions and increase economic opportunity. I would like to focus on three.

The first is industrial carbon pricing, which was brought into effect in Alberta in 2008 by Progressive Conservative Premier Ed Stelmach's government. This made-in-Alberta solution drives meaningful emissions reductions through economic incentives and the polluter pays principle.

### *Government Orders*

The second is a focus on methane. This is the low-hanging fruit of emissions reductions. A focus on methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas, offers some of the most meaningful and lower-cost emissions reductions.

The third is carbon capture and sequestration. Investment tax credits and other policy levers would encourage the creation at scale of an industry that will meaningfully change the emissions profile of the oil and gas sector and take carbon out of production. Not only would this reduce Canada's emissions, but it would be an essential, exportable technology that increases our prosperity while reducing and even removing emissions across the globe.

In total, budget 2025 sets the foundation for long-term growth. It would shift from short-term spending to smart investment, it would invest public dollars to attract even bigger private dollars and it would make Canada more prosperous, more resilient and more ready for the future.

I want to speak to what budget 2025 would mean for Calgary, because the city I proudly represent stands to benefit greatly. Calgary is home to engineers, builders, energy workers, tech innovators, students, researchers and many more. It is a diverse workplace. Budget 2025's emphasis on productivity and investment directly aligns with Calgary's economic strengths. The investment tax credits would be a direct accelerator for Calgary and would help unlock billions in private investment in Alberta.

Budget 2025 would support exactly the kinds of projects Calgary is best suited to build. It would strengthen Canada as a conventional and renewable energy superpower and support the infrastructure needed to export energy in all forms. It would provide clarity around long-term GHG regulations, which is essential for supporting Alberta's energy sector as it invests in decarbonization and competes globally.

Budget 2025 would introduce community infrastructure funding that would also benefit Calgary directly. I have already had the privilege of announcing new investments in housing and cultural spaces, and more will follow as a consequence of this budget's unprecedented investment. Calgary is an ambitious city, and this is an ambitious budget.

*Government Orders*

Budget 2025 would invest in productivity so that we can grow the economy, in infrastructure so that we can build the economy and in people so that every Canadian can participate in the economy. It would do so within a fiscal framework built on responsibility and sustainability that shifts from spending on operations to financing growth. The budget implementation act would put this into law—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Can I interrupt? There is a member with a phone that is buzzing. It is very disturbing for the interpreters.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, the budget implementation act would put this into law. It would enable the investments, the tax changes, the housing measures and the competitiveness strategy that budget 2025 lays out.

We often talk in this chamber about the future, what kind of country we want to build, what kinds of opportunities we want to leave our children and how we can ensure that Canada remains strong, prosperous and secure in an unpredictable world. This budget is the answer to those questions. It is a plan to build Canada strong economically, socially, environmentally and in our sovereignty.

Let us pass the budget implementation act, let us implement this budget and let us get to work building the future Canadians deserve.

**Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I would agree with the member opposite that Calgary is indeed an ambitious city, having lived there for 10 years of my life and having a wife from Calgary.

Will the parliamentary secretary say on behalf of his government when an energy pipeline will be built to tidewater, whether it is an oil pipeline to the B.C. coast or something like the former energy east program to the Atlantic provinces? If we want to increase the GDP significantly, the fastest, best and most significant way is through private sector investment in an energy pipeline.

• (1210)

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, it is true that pipelines are the safest, most environmentally responsible way to move oil products, and they are also the cheapest way. There are a lot of benefits to them.

Of course, if we are going to continue to build oil infrastructure, we need to do it in a way that is still consistent with our goals to be net zero in 2050, which is exactly what the Prime Minister has said. He has said that if we can make progress on things such as the Pathways project to sequester carbon, there are lots of opportunities for additional take-away capacity. That is oil sector speak for additional pipelines, which would allow us to increase our export opportunities.

[*Translation*]

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Calgary Confederation for his speech. Obviously, we have heard a lot about his concern for the oil and gas industry, and that is reflected in the budget.

That is not the problem. The oil industry has virtually unlimited financial resources. The people who need help are in the forestry industry. Since last fall, 600 jobs in Abitibi—Témiscamingue have been affected by the forestry crisis, yet Ottawa is not making any investments in that area.

Last week, Arbec Forest Products announced that 100 people in Amos would be laid off just before Christmas. One hundred families will be affected. I am also thinking about the entire ecosystem, about the ordinary workers who invested tens or even hundreds of thousands of dollars in machinery and equipment thinking that there would be a thriving industry, but Ottawa is not delivering.

What is the parliamentary secretary actually going to do to help the people in the forestry industry, who are the ones who need it most?

[*English*]

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, of course, the situation the forestry sector faces is absolutely untenable and unjustified, and it is based on long-standing trade disputes with the United States.

Budget 2025 offers a number of supports for the forestry sector, including a new biomass ITC that would now be retroactive to 2023, which would allow investments in plants that use residuals, making sawmills more economical. It also very firmly plants a flag that we will buy Canadian and that Canadian products will be first and foremost when we are building Canadian homes. Very explicitly, that is also Canadian lumber.

These are no silver bullets. They are part of an overall plan that would increase access to markets, which is good for forestry; increase tax credits for the forest sector, which is good for forestry; and increase the size of the domestic market, which is good for forestry.

**Hon. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, what I took from my hon. colleague's speech was the focus on investment in our country versus expenses. He used mortgages as an example and how mortgages can be seen as an expense. Certainly, they are one of the largest investments in a Canadian's life.

We hear on a regular basis from across the aisle about things like the CPP, the Canada pension plan, being a tax or a bill. How do we combat that misinformation and disinformation when we think about young people in our country being told that things like the Canada pension plan are a tax, rather than an investment in their own future?

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, it is an excellent point. The reality is that finance is much more nuanced than that. Conversations about the size of a spend entirely miss the point if we are not talking about what is being spent.

In the case of the CPP, which is the example that was put in front of me, it is not even a government investment; it is an investment made on behalf of all Canadians in their future. It has created one of the largest pools of capital in the western world and has been a great source of strength for this country.

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Madam Speaker, when Canadians saw the budget that was presented to Canada, I think they could have used two words to describe it: sticker shock. It is sticker shock because of the \$78 billion presented as the deficit. This is, of course, \$16 billion more than the Prime Minister promised during the campaign. It is double what the last prime minister, Justin Trudeau, spent, and he spent more than all prime ministers combined. It is also the most this country has ever spent outside of the pandemic years.

Let us go through some more numbers. There is over \$90 billion of new spending. The Liberals have called these generational investments, but they are in fact generational debt. I will talk a bit about what this budget means for those who will have to pay for it later. What I mean by generational debt is the Liberal government would add more than \$320 billion of federal debt over the next five years and the cycle of the budget. Again, that is more than what Justin Trudeau was going to add, because he was at about \$154 billion.

The budget would add \$10 million of debt every hour. That matters, because like any other debt Canadians incur, they pay interest on that debt. We would pay \$55 billion just to service that debt every single year. That is not money that would be going to doctors, hospitals or nurses. In fact, it is more than the government transfers to the provinces for health care. It is also the amount the government collects in the GST. This means that every dollar collected in sales tax by the federal government would not go to doctors, hospitals or nurses, but to bankers to service that debt.

The weak economic performance in this budget should alarm Canadians more than just the sticker shock. It has real GDP growth in 2025 at 1.1%, which is the second-lowest in the G7, and unemployment averages at 6.4% over the coming years. The industrial carbon tax would remain in place and will get higher.

This should all be concerning, but what is most concerning about this budget is that it tells a story of two different Canadas that would be created. There would be those who work for wages and see nothing at all in relief in this budget, and those who invest for income. Those two groups have been targeted very differently. The problem is that the first group, those who go to work every single day and collect a paycheque, would not see anything in this budget, and it is concerning.

This country has an overwhelming amount of potential, but it seems that at every turn over the last 10 years, that potential has been squandered. We have everything the world wants, and we should be the richest country in the world, but we have a government that is spending away our future on a credit card with very little to show for it.

We have a federal bureaucracy that has grown by 99,000 workers over the last 10 years, and now we have a government that cannot say where workforce reductions will come from. By the way, none of our services have ever gotten better. In fact, people wait longer

### *Government Orders*

for services. People wait on the phone with the CRA only to maybe get somebody, and if they get somebody, 80% of answers have been found to be incorrect. It takes longer to get a passport. It takes longer to reach anybody on the phone, yet the public service has grown and the services have gotten worse. That is what we would end up paying for in this budget.

Let us talk more about the tale of two Canadas. If a person draws their income from a portfolio, this budget might have a few things for them. It has some of the good ideas that we brought forward in the last election campaign, although it does not go far enough.

• (1215)

We talk about resource development. The government has been beating its chest about a pipeline announcement that will come to the table at some point, whether in six days, six weeks or maybe not at all. In case it does come, because the Premier of Alberta and the news media are talking about it like it is a done deal, this is a government that has invested in more bureaucracy rather than just going ahead and getting out of its own way. In order to build a pipeline in this country, we have to get rid of things like a shipping ban off the west coast.

We would applaud the government if it came out and said what it was going to do. We would have to get rid of an oil and gas cap in order for anything to be filled in that pipeline and to take it somewhere, such as tidewater, eventually, where there is still a shipping ban. We would have to reduce the industrial carbon tax, or at least make sure that this particular project does not have that in the way, just like LNG Canada.

All these things need to happen in order for a pipeline to get built. All these things probably will eventually happen while members of the party opposite drag their feet, kicking and screaming. However, it is the Prime Minister who sabotaged all that during his tenure as an adviser to the Liberal government. When the former prime minister cancelled the 2016 pipeline, or when he got in the way of it being built, frankly, and put in that shipping ban, it was the current Prime Minister who cheered him on from the sidelines. People can read about it in his very own book. When I talk about the budget and squandering its potential, these are the things I mean.

*Government Orders*

This country has the smartest people in the world. We have enough food to feed ourselves and the rest of the world. Instead, there are two million people lined up at food banks. Four million people are going to use a food bank in Canada, and the government wants to be thanked for introducing a food program. That is always the government's answer: Create more bureaucracy. When it cannot get a project built, it announces a project management office that will shuffle papers and eventually give an approval for something that has already been approved, as in the case of one pipeline. If it causes food inflation to soar with its hidden taxes, like an industrial carbon tax that raises the tax on producers, a packaging tax that raises the tax on the purchasers of food or any of the other hidden food taxes, it comes in with a big government program to ensure Canadians will thank them, while two million people are still in the food bank line and while food costs 40% more here than it does in the U.S. It is always about centralization. It is always about making sure we thank the government for bringing in another program to get rid of the problems the government itself has caused over the last 10 years.

That is the tale of the two Canadas. Those who work for a living are constantly trying to get further with less. An inflationary budget that spends \$78 billion is going to ensure that it gets worse, not better. Today, we have nine out of 10 young Canadians not believing they will ever buy a home. The government's answer to that was to create yet another housing bureaucracy, the fourth, to try to get houses built when the first three did not work. The government dumped \$13 billion into yet another government project.

Canadians who work every single day for wages are wondering what the heck is in this budget for them and when they are going to see some reprieve. We have a lessening standard of living in this country. The fear we have is that young people will just get used to this idea. They will get used to the idea that they cannot afford a good meal, that they cannot afford to purchase a home and that they cannot afford a good-quality life in what should be the richest country in the world. It was not like this 10 years ago.

This budget does nothing to alleviate the pain of those who go to work every single day and who are looking to the government for answers. It has provided none for those people. That is why the Conservatives cannot and will not support \$78 billion of new inflationary spending that will raise taxes and inflation on every single Canadian in every single part of their life.

• (1220)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, suffice it to say that I disagree with virtually everything the member opposite has said. Look at the national budget that we brought forward. It has received a wide spectrum of support in virtually every region. I believe even Doug Ford, the Premier of Ontario, wanted to see this particular budget passed. We have a prime minister who has been working with provinces, indigenous leaders and so many other stakeholders to build a stronger, healthier Canada with major projects and to invest in Canadians and so forth, yet all we hear from the Conservative Party is negativity. That is it.

My advice to the member opposite and the Conservative caucus as a whole is that Canada is not broken. Canada is still the very best country in the world to call home. That is what we continue to work

for on the government benches: to build the strongest, healthiest economy in the G7. That is our goal. We will achieve that goal.

That was more of a comment than an actual question.

• (1225)

**Melissa Lantsman:** Madam Speaker, it seems as if there is always a comment from that member.

I said in the House that Canada has the utmost potential. We have the smartest people in the world, the resources everybody wants and enough food to feed the world, but we are squandering that every single day through higher deficits, higher inflation and higher taxes. We have red tape in the way of building homes, mines, factories and pipelines.

We simply want to see an end to the inflationary deficit. We want to see the cutting of taxes for everyone, and a government that rewards hard work and that will restore affordability for every single Canadian. I know that is not too much to ask, and I know the member opposite understands the value of an opposition regarding an unchecked prime minister.

[Translation]

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I find it interesting to hear my colleague talk about the consequences this budget will have on taxpayers.

Is it normal for the federal government to invest public money to purchase a pipeline, as it did with Trans Mountain? Elsewhere in the budget, tens of billions of dollars is being paid out in subsidies. The forestry industry is basically being ignored in this budget, yet tens of billions of dollars are being poured into the oil and gas industry once again.

Is it normal to invest public money in the oil sands, in oil and gas?

[English]

**Melissa Lantsman:** Madam Speaker, we would not have to do that if the government just got out of its own way and reduced impediments to resource development in this country, approved projects in such a way that private sector proponents would want to invest here, lifted the oil and gas cap, stopped the shipping ban and lowered the industrial carbon tax so that it makes sense or, since it is going to do so on this project, stopped it from even being charged on the project when it is announced.

We are going to applaud the government on announcing a pipeline, but we are not sure if everybody on that side agrees.

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I wonder if the member is as perplexed as I am right now about the comment the Prime Minister made when asked if he had been in communication with Donald Trump. He said, “Who cares?” He said that there is no “burning issue”, but 75% to 80% of our trade is with the States, mills are closing down and the automobile sector in British Columbia is losing jobs.

I wonder if the member could comment on the Prime Minister's nonchalance.

**Melissa Lantsman:** Madam Speaker, for all those who are watching, the Prime Minister ran an election predicated on the biggest impediment to Canada's growing economy: U.S. trade tariffs. We heard him say that he does not care.

I want those who are watching at home to know that Conservatives care. The Conservatives care about the job losses in the auto sector from Windsor to Oshawa and everywhere in between. They care about the tariffs that have now tripled on steel and aluminum. They care about the jobs in the forestry sector. There is one party in the House that cares, and that is the Conservative Party. I want Canadians to know we are never going to write off the relationship with the U.S. in an “I don't care”, nonchalant moment. That is not what a leader does. It is not what a leader should do.

[*Translation*]

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise to highlight a clear message that the new federal budget is sending: Our country is choosing to invest in its culture, in its artists and in the diversity that shapes our collective identity. In a world where globalization and digital platforms profoundly altering our habits, we are making it clear that the Canadian voice must be protected, supported and celebrated.

As a proud francophone member and a proud representative of diversity, I know that culture is not merely an artistic expression. It is a vehicle for inclusion, social cohesion and belonging. Culture brings our stories, our regions, our languages and our generations together. Simply put, culture is a reflection of our diversity and the glue that holds our collective identity together.

This budget is designed to address challenges in an ambitious yet responsible way. It includes a historic investment over four years beginning next year to strengthen our cultural and creative ecosystem. This is one of the most ambitious investments in our recent history. It will help modernize our institutions, stimulate Canadian content creation, ensure our artists receive fairer compensation and support French-language and regional production. In short, we want to continue to showcase Canada at home and abroad.

Allow me to highlight a number of key measures: \$150 million for Telefilm Canada to bolster film and documentary production; \$127 million for the Canada Media Fund to support television and digital creation; \$26 million for the National Film Board of Canada to support documentary production and narrative innovation; and \$48 million for the Canada Music Fund to help Canadian artists succeed in a highly competitive global market.

These are not abstract commitments. They will provide employment through timely opportunities for our young creators and result in works that reflect our country's linguistic and cultural diversity.

### *Government Orders*

They will also help preserve regional and francophone voices, such as Quebec's voice, which are key to maintaining the richness and diversity of our identity.

This budget also introduces a long-awaited measure: an artist's resale right, which will now provide visual artists with a royalty whenever their work is resold. This is a major step forward in ensuring our creators are recognized and compensated fairly.

As culture is not experienced only in big performance halls or major national institutions, the budget also supports our local festivals, Canada Day and National Acadian Day celebrations, and community cultural projects. In fact, when I was in Fredericton earlier this year for National Acadian Day, I ran into Martin Théberge, who was then chair of the Société nationale de l'Acadie, although his term ended two weeks ago, I think. He told me that he thought the government should invest effectively so that National Acadian Day could be celebrated all across the country. In this budget, our government is answering that call with an increase in funding.

Culture is what gives us our vibrant neighbourhoods, villages, communities and regions. It is what creates those first stirrings of belonging for so many families, including diaspora communities, whom I have the honour of representing here. It is important to keep in mind that culture is also an industry. The cultural and creative sector represents tens of thousands of jobs, contributes to our GDP, attracts talent and spurs innovation. Every dollar invested generates major economic and social benefits. When we support our creators, we also support our industry, our technologies and our global competitiveness. At a time when many countries are cutting back on investing in culture, Canada is doing the opposite. We are choosing to invest more so that we can protect and strengthen our culture and help it to shine on the world stage.

• (1230)

This budget is not just a series of numbers, it is a statement of principles. Culture is not a luxury, but a necessity. It holds our collective identity together and drives our creativity and our economic prosperity. By supporting these measures, our country is choosing a Canada that is proud of its roots, open to the world, but resolutely committed to what makes us unique. Culture is also a heritage to be protected, a driver of prosperity, and the beating heart of our democracy.

This budget once again underscores the fact that we are listening to the arts community and to artists across the country.

• (1235)

[*English*]

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to quote for my colleague his own leader. On September 17, in this very House, he said, “We are going to have a declining level of debt.” The budget actually shows the opposite: a growing debt, worse even than what was planned under Trudeau, so who is being forthright and honest?

*Government Orders*

Is it a declining debt, as the Prime Minister states, or is it a massively increasing debt, as the budget states? Which is it?

[*Translation*]

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba:** Madam Speaker, it always surprises me when my friends across the way associate us with Mr. Trudeau, since he is no longer here. We are a new government and we have presented a new budget, an investment budget to grow this country.

I talked about artists and how our government has increased investments for them. That is what we are doing.

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Madam Speaker, my colleague referred to French-language content and what is in the budget, but there is almost nothing for official languages in the budget. I think there is a measure for National Acadian Day, which is a good thing. However, I am not the only one who has criticized this shortcoming in the budget.

Since 2020, the Liberals have been saying that the federal government has a responsibility to protect French both inside and outside Quebec. However, no new measures have been introduced since the last version of the Official Languages Act.

Does my colleague believe that it would be great if the government could comply with its own law and take action to promote French in Quebec?

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba:** Madam Speaker, I believe that our government is the only one that has made additional investments to promote French both inside and outside Quebec. I have visited francophone communities outside Quebec on two occasions. Today, we can say that French outside Quebec is growing and that it will soon exceed the 4% target.

We have invested more than \$7 billion to promote French both inside and outside Quebec. I think that this budget meets the needs of francophones both inside and outside Quebec.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague on his excellent speech.

I would like to follow up on the previous questions. Through the action plan for official languages 2023-2028, we made the largest investment ever made in official languages in Canada. I am talking about \$4.1 billion over five years for education, health care, early childhood education and various other sectors.

In budget 2025, we doubled the funding for National Acadian Day and made it permanent. We also set an ambitious new francophone immigration target, which will help increase the demographic weight of francophones.

My colleague recently attended the general meeting of the Société nationale de l'Acadie. How do francophones outside Quebec feel about these investments in official languages and our ambitious francophone immigration targets?

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba:** Madam Speaker, I recently spent two days in Fredericton for National Acadian Day. What I found there was a united people, a tight-knit community that is proud to speak French, proud to know that we stand beside them. They knew that we would heed their call.

Today, we have done just that and increased the budget. This morning, we are proud to say that National Acadian Day will continue to be part of Canada's culture and that it will bring together francophones from across the country.

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Madam Speaker, what my colleague just said in response to my question was completely false. There was no measure to protect French in Quebec. I studied the action plan for official languages 2023-2028, and even Quebec's minister of the French language looked it over and was surprised to see no measures.

I also studied the 2023-24 public accounts, and nowhere was there any new measure for French in Quebec. There were only measures for the English-language education system, English-speaking lobby groups, English-speaking community development, the English-language health care system and access to English-language legal services. There was nothing new for French.

• (1240)

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba:** Madam Speaker, my colleague opposite defends his ideas as though he is the only person in Quebec who speaks French. I am a francophone by birth. In fact, I want to remind the House—

[*English*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Prince Albert.

**Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is always great to rise in the House to talk about things that are important to Canadians. Of course a budget implementation act is something we would all like to think is very important to Canadians.

This budget really is an omnibus bill full of hypocrisy. The member for Winnipeg North would probably agree with me when I talk about hypocrisy, because I can remember the days when he talked about omnibus bills and how bad, how horrible, they were, yet here he is today defending one.

A classic example is what the bill is supposed to do for people in Saskatchewan. I think of the agriculture sector, which is important to me; there is nothing of substance in the bill to help canola farmers and to help fisheries workers, both of whom are facing tariffs out of China and need market relief and market help to gain market access into not only the Chinese market but also other markets around the world. There is nothing really set aside to assist these guys to work with them.

There is nothing in the budget for the forestry sector, other than more debt and more loans. There is nothing there that would give people in the forestry sector a game plan to solve the problems they have with the U.S., to actually look at expanding their markets into other parts of the world and to look at using wood and wood products in different ways that would take them into the next generation and allow them to export throughout the world.

What is there? There is a piece regarding the Canada Post Corporation. What that has to do with budget implementation, I am not sure, but it is there.

*Government Orders*

There is a piece respecting Farm Credit Canada that is concerning. It is important to talk about Farm Credit Canada to make sure it is delivering things in the most effective and meaningful way. The minister would have a report, not this year or next year but in five years, when there is no longer a Liberal government, to report to the committee about Farm Credit and how it is operating and functioning.

I remember the days when banks would not touch farming. I remember there was a reason Farm Credit Canada was an organization created to help farmers: There was a time and place where banks looked at farming as too much risk. FCC has been a great partner for the farming community right across Canada. Now, as I see the government wanting to pry into FCC, I am suspicious of what its motive is.

If the Liberals want to do something proper with respect to FCC, they should not put it in a budget implementation act. They should run it through the agriculture committee, which should actually do a study on it and then come back to the House with its own set of motions, but no, the Liberals put it in the budget implementation act.

Respecting the Special Economic Measures Act, it looks to me as if the finance department and Global Affairs cannot get along. Historically, under these measures, if it wanted to put a restriction on a financial institution, Global Affairs could do that. However, now it would not be able to. It would have more red tape, and Global Affairs officials would have to talk to finance officials before they could take action. Again, this just puts more red tape into things that need to be done faster and more efficiently.

I also see things in the budget that the Liberals have stolen from the Conservative Party, and they are good things. The member for Winnipeg North cannot accuse me of saying nothing good. I see the First Nations Goods and Services Tax Act. The budget would empower First Nations to tax themselves, to consider a sales tax for themselves to raise revenues to fulfill their financial requirements to meet the needs of their people.

This is a Conservative value. It is something that was in the Conservative platform and that the Liberal Party gladly stole, and it is something I could get behind, but it should be its own piece of legislation; it should not be part of the budget implementation act. It should be something that goes through the appropriate committees in the appropriate time frame to flesh out all the issues around it so it can be done properly. It deserves more than a two-minute reading in a committee, in with 600 pages of other items. It is a good policy, but it would not see the proper light of day and the proper scrutiny.

Why would things concerning the Broadcasting Act, for example, be in a budget implementation act? Why would they not be their own act that would go through committees on its own? Why do they have to be part of the BIA?

I see the Human Pathogens and Toxins Act. Members should think about that. It has nothing to do with finance. The Liberal government is exposing its hypocrisy, shoving things into one bill to avoid utilizing the House of Commons, Parliament and the commit-

tee structure to get a better bill, to get better oversight and to get a better piece of legislation that would benefit all Canadians.

Did folks know that the Aeronautics Act is in the budget? Yes, it is, but no, we would not be funding a space program; we would just be changing some meanings of the act.

We could not get canola in the budget. We could not get forestry workers in there. We could not get fishery workers in there.

• (1245)

We could not get things in the budget that would actually reduce the cost to Canadians. We could not get things that would actually protect Canadians and their financial stability in the future, which is something the Liberal Party ran on. It talked about, in its campaign, how it was going to protect Canadians. It was going to make sure it got the best deal, elbows up, with Donald Trump, and all that. There is nothing in the budget that it talked about in its election campaign to protect Canadians, other than putting them at more risk with higher debt and higher interest payments that they, their grandkids and their great-grandkids are going to have to pay.

That is what the government put on the Canadian population, yet it still found time to include all these things that really are not Canadian priorities but are priorities of the bureaucracy or are pet projects of the Liberal government.

Coming from Saskatchewan, I believe it is important when a budget comes along that the needs of the people of Saskatchewan are at least talked about and represented. It is important that people across Canada feel that the budget is actually going to be something that will benefit them as they move forward, that will make life easier and more affordable. There is nothing in the budget implementation act or in the budget itself that really does that.

The budget is really a shell game. It talks about things that either have already been approved and done or that are high and mighty and really would not accomplish anything. The budget implementation act is more about bureaucrats with pet projects, who are trying to manoeuvre and take advantage of a new government to get their own personal will done, not the will of Canadians. It is rather disappointing and disturbing to see in this type of bill.

I come back to the omnibus style of the bill. The hypocrisy shown by the Liberal government is totally unbelievable, but I guess we should not be surprised; the Liberals have been full of hypocrisy over the last 10 years by creating a problem and then basically saying that they are the only ones who have a solution for it. The Liberals have created a problem in this country with bad policies over the last 10 years.

*Government Orders*

The Liberals have made our country stagnant. They have created economic policies that have put our kids in a scenario where they will probably never be able to buy a house, instead of using the budget implementation act or the budget to put in proper policies that would make life more affordable for Canadians and to look at things that would help protect seniors in their retirement and things that would grow the economy.

Policies have to be right, and the Liberals have not made the right policies. With anything they get wrong, what they do is throw more money at it, thinking it will go away. If one does not fix the problem, one does not get a proper solution. Money does not always fix the problem.

I am going to leave it at that. I am letting the House know that the budget implementation act is a severe disappointment because it could have done so much. It had the opportunity, and it had the will of Canadians who wanted the government to do things for them that would succeed. The government let us down again.

This is a horrible budget implementation act. It is an ominous bill. It should not see the light of day, and I absolutely will not vote for it.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, there is no shock on this side that the member opposite is not going to vote in favour of the budget. At the end of the day, we need to recognize the contrast between the Conservative Party and the government, the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party believes that we have to invest in Canadians and in the economy. Now is a great time to do it.

Coincidentally, every premier of the provinces and territories is in agreement. They are working with Ottawa. The Prime Minister is out securing additional potential markets for trade beyond the Canada-U.S. border. We have a budget that delivers; from children to seniors, it covers the spectrum.

However, the Conservatives want to stand by, do nothing, spread misinformation wherever they can, and say they want to be in government some day. Where is the plan? Does the Conservative Party of Canada even have a plan to present to Canadians?

**Randy Hoback:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Winnipeg North for hosting the Saskatchewan Roughriders and the Grey Cup. He did a great job, and we really appreciate that fact. I know he is a closet Roughriders fan.

There is a big difference between the Liberal and Conservative approaches. The Liberals would rather take taxpayers' money and throw it at a problem instead of sitting back, analyzing the problem and fixing the policy that is creating it. If one fixes the policy, one creates the private investment that will see the economy grow.

What do the Liberals do? They take the other way. If the Liberals have a problem, instead of fixing it, they just throw more money at it. They put a band-aid on it and say that it will be fine for now, because that will get them through to the next election. In the meantime, that compounds the problem. We have seen that compounding effect over the last 10 years, hitting our economy as we speak today. We cannot allow the Liberals to do that anymore.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, we agree that the budget contains massive amounts of money for the deficit and huge amounts for defence. That is a \$78-billion deficit with more than \$50 billion invested in defence.

Does my colleague think it is responsible to invest in defence by using deficit spending?

[*English*]

**Randy Hoback:** Madam Speaker, I wish we had a surplus so we could spend money with that surplus, but reality is reality. The government has mismanaged the economy so badly over the last 10 years that we are in a deficit.

The reality is that this world is not the place it was 15 or 20 years ago. Unfortunately, we will have to borrow money and we will have to spend it on defence. We will have to make sure our men and women in the military have the tools they need to protect our country. There is no way around that. I would love to see it happen under a different financial situation, no question about that, but we are not given that luxury because of bad management by the Liberal government.

**Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Saskatchewan on his Grey Cup win.

The Liberals have spoken out many times against omnibus legislation, but here we are again, and they have done it many times. Another thing the Liberals often do is throw money at things. To note one particular statistic from this budget, after five years of Liberal governance, it would add another \$321 billion to our debt.

I am going to ask the member one simple question. Does he think throwing money at the problem is going to solve the issues in Canada?

I am not seeing any infrastructure getting built in northern B.C. We need a bridge across the Peace River, but that has not been done. I do not see it in the budget. Does the member think throwing money at problems solves them? I have not seen that yet.

**Randy Hoback:** Madam Speaker, during the 2008 crisis, the Harper government spent money on infrastructure. It was put into lift stations. It was put into things that were not considered sexy items. It was for things that Canadians needed in order to have a proper functioning economy.

Yes, we need proper investments so we can actually feel and touch the assets that Canadians looked at. I want to remind members that during that time frame, it was not the government that picked the projects; it was the municipal governments and the provincial governments. Here, the federal government is dictating which projects get a green light and which do not. A committee was just set up for big beautiful projects. The Liberals should look at all 10 of them.

**Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise to support the generational budget from the finance minister. We all listened very keenly to the budget speech given by the finance minister, and we have had a glance at the numerous very positive media reports on this ambitious, robust and confident budget. The budget, as it says on the cover, is what it says on the tin: It is here to build Canada strong.

It is an absolute privilege to stand here and talk about the responsible approach we have taken to setting up investments in key areas that are important to our country, investments that set the foundation for generations of success. The Prime Minister was right when he said that we cannot control what other countries do, but we can control what we build.

The “Canada Strong” budget is the biggest investment in our nation's infrastructure in a generation. It is a budget for all Canadians, and it delivers where it matters most for families: in jobs, health and safety. This is a budget that keeps Canadian dollars in Canada, working locally, building nationally, going everywhere and doing everything, all at once.

As I was going around my riding of Don Valley North this past weekend, what struck me was the absolute confidence that the electorate had in our Prime Minister's leadership and in this government's direction as we navigate a rapidly changing and more hostile world. People have come up to me and said that this is a budget for the times.

We can see why. When I met with youths at the S.E.A.S. Centre, Wordswell, IWOO, Working Women, and Newcomer Women's Services, many shared that through Canada summer jobs, they made their first meaningful connection to the workforce. At the Flemingdon Health Centre, I heard directly from staff how federal investments have helped them serve vulnerable residents with language programs, mental health support and community health resources. These are real examples of how the budget meets the moment.

The budget from the finance minister is our government's plan to build Canada into the strongest economy in the G7. It is focused on catalyzing Canada's growth over the longer term. That is good for the economy. Most importantly, it is good for Canadian families. In Don Valley North, families have told me what they value most in the budget: infrastructure, housing, community safety and health.

Because health is top of mind for every Canadian, let me highlight what the budget delivers. Residents in Don Valley North, from Bayview Village to Hillcrest to Henry Farm to Bayview Woods-Steeles to York Mills, all want a health care system that is modern, accessible and people-centred. Budget 2025 delivers exactly that.

### *Government Orders*

The \$5-billion health infrastructure fund would modernize hospitals, urgent care centres and ERs, and would expand medical schools so that families get care in spaces designed for today. The \$97-million foreign credential recognition action fund would help internationally trained doctors, nurses and specialists get licensed faster. The national dental program, already helping seniors and children in Don Valley North, would be strengthened so that more families can access preventative care and avoid costly emergencies.

These health investments are not abstract. They are real improvements in people's daily lives.

Strengthening health care also means strengthening the research and innovation ecosystem that drives discovery, new treatments and long-term competitiveness. Budget 2025 makes some of the most significant research investments in more than a decade, strengthening Canadian leadership in life sciences, digital health, AI, biomanufacturing and clean technologies.

The budget also modernizes Canada's talent attraction strategy, ensuring that world-class researchers, scientists, engineers and innovators see Canada as the place to build their career. These investments will shape the future of medicine, improve patient care and support the health innovation economy that communities like Don Valley North are deeply connected to.

Health is shaped by more than clinical care. It is also shaped by nutrition, connection and the supports that help people thrive. Budget 2025 continues these investments.

At Cliffwood Public School, the national school food program ensures that students start their day nourished and ready to learn. Through the new horizons program, seniors at the Bayview Village Association stay active, engaged and socially connected, all proven determinants of better health. These are the very people who will feel the benefit of a stronger, more accessible health care system.

We are investing to make Canada the best country to be young and grow old in. From the tax credit for personal support workers to the tax cut for 22 million Canadians, we are building Canada strong. I am very proud, as a member of this government, to say “well done” to the Prime Minister and the finance minister for delivering the “Canada Strong” budget, a budget that is not merely an economic investment but a necessity for our sovereignty. Its long-term significance, I believe, will be absolute.

*Government Orders*

• (1255)

This budget reflects not only the values of our government, but the aspirations of the people of Don Valley North, people who believe in community, progress and building Canada strong for the next generation.

**Eric Melillo (Kenora—Kiiwetinoong, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and participate in the debate today.

Speaking of the budget, many people I spoke to across north-western Ontario had sticker shock. They could not believe the amount of spending and the amount of the deficit. After the Prime Minister promised spending would go down, it has gone up. He promised the deficit would go down, but it has gone up. On all the measures the Prime Minister has set for himself, he is missing the mark.

I am wondering if the member can explain why those measures were missed. Can she talk about the effect this will have on the next generation, which will have to pay back the massive deficit?

• (1300)

**Maggie Chi:** Madam Speaker, I thank the member opposite for the question. It gives me an opportunity to highlight some of the measures and investments we included in this budget, which will build Canada strong for the next generation and the current generation.

In the budget, we are making generational investments in major projects, for example through community strong infrastructure funds. We are building new hospitals. We are building new ERs. We are building medical schools. This will expand capacities and at the same time create good high-tech and research jobs, as I mentioned in my speech.

These are exciting opportunities. I talk to folks in Don Valley North, and they are excited to see them unfold. I also want to highlight that, in my riding, the North York General Hospital will really benefit from the research innovation in this budget.

[Translation]

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts. The Bloc Québécois wanted the budget to include an increase in old age security for seniors aged 65 to 74. Everyone knows that the OAS was increased for those over 75, but seniors aged 65 to 74 also need support, since many of them have ended up living in poverty. No adjustments are planned to close this gap. The government has created two classes of seniors and has no interest in fixing that.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[English]

**Maggie Chi:** Madam Speaker, in this budget, we have a number of affordability measures. If the hon. member looks carefully, he will see the tax cut for 22 million Canadians. The new horizons for seniors program is a very good program that seniors in my riding of Don Valley North really enjoy accessing to stay connected to the community. When we have a very connected, healthy population, it saves costs down the road.

With respect to what the member asked, I look forward to having further conversations on it.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, health is a top priority for the people in my riding. My colleague highlighted some of the investments we are making in the budget for it, such as the investment in research and the new health infrastructure fund. We are also going to increase transfers to provinces over the next five years.

I would like to hear the member's view on why the investments in health are so important for the people in her riding of Don Valley North, for the people in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche and for all Canadians.

**Maggie Chi:** Madam Speaker, indeed, health care is such a major component of our identity. We highlighted in our budget that we are making major investments to strengthen it through the health infrastructure fund of \$5 billion to modernize hospitals, build our ER capacity and train more health professionals. This will increase benefits for seniors and the people in Don Valley North.

**Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am just curious. Can the member explain to me why the government felt it needed to include things like stablecoins in the BIA? Something like a stablecoin should probably have its own piece of legislation because of the new aspect of this financial tool.

Why would the Liberals include stuff like this in the BIA? Why would they not introduce it as its own legislation in Parliament?

**Maggie Chi:** Madam Speaker, I look forward to having a further discussion on this.

**Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, for months, Canadians have waited to see how the government, elected on promises of fiscal foresight, economic integrity and monetary wizardry, would turn the fortunes of this nation around. If Canadians expected any sort of responsible governance from this budget, they were sorely disappointed. Instead, they got a glossy communications document full of arbitrary promises about vague infrastructure spending, all dressed up behind a clever new accounting trick: "Canadians rejoice, because the government no longer racks up debt but now makes capital investments." These can be whatever the government wants. Apparently, the invisible hand of the market has struck a secret deal guaranteeing billions of investments from unknown private sector benefactors.

*Government Orders*

To be clear, private sector investment can be beneficial to the nation, but banking on it to fund infrastructure spending is not. All of that is to say that the government can be forgiven for taking what I am sure it thinks is a bold new approach to government financing. After all, along with the black shoes and white shirts in the PMO, the Prime Minister also brought a new fiscal calendar with him from his time in London, which is why we are now speaking to the budget in November instead of the more traditional spring. However, the budget is just that: a statement of intentions. It remains to be seen what Parliament actually approves and how the government spends the money.

I will give the government credit for one thing. It is refreshing to finally see some relief for the ever-suffering estimates process. We have time to flesh out the mains instead of diving through a budget and estimates at almost the same time.

I will move on to the content of the budget itself.

One notable piece of the budget that is of great concern not just for my constituents but also for law-abiding firearm owners across the nation is the arbitrary ad hoc firearms policy. We might think that, after three decades, at least one person would take the time to inform themselves about how firearms operate, yet here we are, a full 33 years after the initial launch of the long-gun registry, with this budget in 2025. Still, the Liberals are chasing that elusive dragon. The budget proudly claims that “Weapons made for the battlefield do not belong on Canadian streets”. I cannot begin to fathom the cartoonish ignorance of this statement, and it boggles the mind that this line went through dozens, if not hundreds, of sets of eyes before seeing publication and not one person stood up and said, “This does not make sense.” It is a clear indication that the government paints our rural farmers, sportsmen, hunters and indigenous communities as gun-crazed fetishists who need to be put under the jackboot of the state, instead of the responsible, mature, respectable and law-abiding gun owners they are.

To make matters worse, we have a public safety minister who, as kind as he might be, has waffled on what exactly this buyback program entails and whether or not it is legally binding. He is telling Canadian gun owners one thing, then telling his tenants something completely different. The government has shown, time and again, that it does not care about gun owners and that, most telling, it does not care to learn about guns or gun owners. No criminals are doing a drive-by shooting in downtown Toronto with a legally purchased SKS.

The Conservatives know this, gun owners know this and criminals themselves know this. I would normally presume the government knows this as well, but, as the age-old saying goes, do not attribute to malice what can be explained by ignorance. I am certainly not going to argue against that, given the 30-plus years of evidence we have.

• (1305)

This dovetails very conveniently into the other concern many rural and small urban centres have, which is crime. The government has made big promises to help combat crime, which is refreshing to hear. However, again, it needs to follow up on its promises instead of rehashing the same promises year after year, budget after budget. This means working with our provincial cousins to ensure they

have the capacities and infrastructure for federal laws to be effective in the first place. We need to move beyond the tired old blame game between federal and provincial governments to get laws passed, jails built and criminals behind bars. This needs to be a priority, one that ought to be championed by the federal government. What the provinces need is leadership and a firm commitment from Ottawa to keep our cities, towns and communities safe.

In tandem with this, and related to my previous point, Ottawa needs to understand that rural Canada exists. There are millions of Canadians who are quite literally nowhere near law enforcement or emergency services. I urge the government to keep this in mind at all times, especially when looking at ways to tackle crime in rural Canada.

Another group that is often lost in discussions in Ottawa is seniors. These are the men and women who built the country we call home today. Their labour, toil, struggles and efforts have granted us a nation that, despite some very real issues, is among the world's greatest countries to live in, and they deserve our respect and admiration. The measures in the budget to combat economic abuse are welcomed. As we all know, financial abuse and fraud especially affect our golden Canadians. It is imperative that the government work with financial institutions to spot instances of abuse and take mitigating steps to protect potential victims. Our aging population is an issue policy-makers have ignored for years, and we do so at our own peril. I urge the government to heed the needs of our seniors and their families. The hallmark of a civilization is how we treat the most vulnerable, and nowhere is that more true than with our seniors.

I would like to finish off by talking about the issue that has been dominating headlines for months now. That issue is trade and, in particular, what this budget and government have been doing on the file of late. Conservatives understood the government wanted to take its shot in negotiating with the United States. We showed patience while the government withheld details, recognizing that not everything can be conducted in full public view. We support efforts to diversify trade relationships. However, what has happened since negotiations have collapsed is very troubling. The Prime Minister campaigned on leadership regarding this file, yet, when it matters most, he is failing to deliver. In the most recent weeks, the government has shown no plan, no urgency and zero accountability. The silence and inaction speak volumes, and none of it inspires confidence.

*Government Orders*

There are two axioms that I need to believe are true. One, trade is good. Two, trade is not finite. Cabinet needs to keep this front of mind. Undermining trade with our closest ally to chase deals with dictatorships in Beijing and the U.A.E. is not just misguided but also reckless. Canada and the United States had and still have the closest relationship between two nations anywhere in the world. Our joint history has stretched for hundreds of years and has been through trials and tribulations far worse than a trade spat, including literal all-out war. Our bond with the United States is unmatched, transcending politics, culture and geography. I urge the government not to take this easy, politically expedient path of disengagement. The decisions we make now will have consequences far beyond the next three years. With the world at a crossroad, war in Europe, sabre-rattling in the South China Sea, and terror and death across Africa and the Middle East, now more than ever, Canada must turn toward, not away from, the country that has always been and will always be there.

In closing, Canadians deserve a government that balances ambition with responsibility. The budget offers flashy promises but little substance. As official opposition, we will continue to demand accountability, transparency and real results, putting our country's future ahead of political spin. Canadians deserve that.

• (1310)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the member made reference to the issue of trade. Let us take a look at that.

I have been a parliamentarian for over 30 years. I cannot name another individual, outside of the Prime Minister, who has been so aggressive in looking for trade opportunities that go beyond the United States border, while at the same time waiting to get the best deal we can with the United States. In the interim, let us look at what has been taking place with Indonesia, China, the Philippines, Africa and the European Union. We have legislation. We have all sorts of actions, with millions of dollars going into billions of dollars of potential future trade because we have a government and a prime minister looking at trade and exports as something that will deliver for Canadians not only for today but also for tomorrow.

I am wondering if the member and her party can support the trade initiatives the Prime Minister and his government are taking today.

• (1315)

**Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** Madam Speaker, this is disturbing. Perhaps I can share some cold, hard truth about the Prime Minister and the lack of action he has had on this file. In fact, he thinks he is going to wait until it makes sense to speak with our neighbours to the south. The Prime Minister has suggested that the age-old adage between Canada and the U.S. is over. Tariffs are hitting all-time highs, key sectors, businesses and families are being affected and this unilateral approach is not working.

[*Translation*]

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that my colleague's speech was very thoughtful, covered a number of issues and was rather nuanced. I appreciate that and hold her in high regard.

My colleague raised the issue of public safety in rural areas. I am very concerned about that particular issue. I was in Notre-Dame-du-Nord yesterday, a village near Ontario, in Témiscamingue, where thefts are becoming increasingly frequent. One possible solution is to have more resources for collaboration between the various police forces. I am thinking of the Sûreté du Québec and the Ontario Provincial Police, as well as the indigenous police forces.

My colleague mentioned that this is a problem elsewhere in rural Canada. Is she seeing an increase in organized crime in our regions? What solutions is she proposing?

[*English*]

**Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the kind remarks by my colleague.

Bringing an approach to Parliament of seasoned compassion and the encouragement of respectful engagement is now more important than ever. We are in an era that is very angry and divided.

I recognize the question my hon. colleague asked about organized crime. Organized crime exists and governments need to step up. Right now, we are seeing so little action from the government, only talk, promises and a flashy budget document giving us lots of “We may do this and we may do that” but very little substance.

I am curious to see what will happen over the next several months because it is just not working right now.

**Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Madam Speaker, my colleague mentioned, in her speech, the government's targeting of law-abiding firearm owners. We have heard in committee, over the last number of weeks, from police chiefs and chiefs of first nations and Inuit communities. They think it is a waste of resources to go after law-abiding firearm owners' firearms.

Does the member think it is a good use of taxpayer money to continue to attack law-abiding firearm owners rather than go after criminals?

**Shelby Kramp-Neuman:** Madam Speaker, law-abiding gun owners are enjoying the outdoors and providing a livelihood.

The government is stuck in a different era. I do not understand how, after 30 years of listening to stakeholders and people in their ridings, members are not getting the facts and are making arbitrary, single-handed decisions that are not focused on rural centres one bit.

*Government Orders*

Have Canadians take a hard look at the legislation. Canadians expect significant change from the government.

[*Translation*]

**Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to take part in the debate on Bill C-15, the 2025 budget implementation bill, and to highlight the significant investments in this budget that will help build Canada strong.

• (1320)

[*English*]

As we know, advanced economies are feeling global economic challenges. Canada is no different. With the historic rise in tariffs posing significant challenges to the Canadian economy, Canadians are feeling the impact in their daily lives.

[*Translation*]

To rise to the challenges of our time and seize new opportunities, we must make historic investments that protect and transform our industries, strengthen our economy and empower Canadians. Our generational investments in housing, infrastructure, defence, productivity and competitiveness will enable us to rise to the challenges. Canada's new government is building a single Canadian economy, powered by major projects of national interest that will connect our regions, diversify our markets and create hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs ranging from skilled trades to cutting-edge technologies.

We are investing by building homes for Canadians; we are investing \$25 billion in building affordable housing at scale.

[*English*]

Through the Build Canada Homes tax measures, incentives and programs, we are building the foundation of Canada's most ambitious housing plan in a generation.

[*Translation*]

These investments are not only for building houses. Budget 2025 proposes a plan to invest \$115 billion to build 21st-century infrastructure.

[*English*]

Projects would be focused on trade and transport, along with supporting indigenous and municipal projects, all of which are key drivers of economic growth and support high-paying careers. To create the right conditions for businesses to invest and drive real, sustainable growth, budget 2025 outlines an ambitious plan to invest \$110 billion to supercharge growth by increasing productivity and competitiveness through such areas as innovation support programs, investments in AI, and major tax credits and incentives.

[*Translation*]

With Bill C-5, our government is moving forward with projects that will build Canada and increase confidence in our security and resilience.

[*English*]

Bill C-15's measures will build a Canada for today and for generations to come. That is how we will build Canada strong.

[*Translation*]

Climate change is real. Fighting climate change is not only our economic duty, it is our moral duty. That is why budget 2025 lays out Canada's new climate competitiveness strategy.

[*English*]

Budget 2025 includes clean economy investment tax credits that will attract investments and help drive Canada's economy toward net zero by 2050.

[*Translation*]

The clean electricity investment tax credit reimburses up to 15% of the capital cost of eligible investments in equipment related to low-emission electricity generation, electricity storage, and electricity transmission between provinces and territories.

Eligibility for this tax credit would be limited to taxable Canadian corporations and certain non-taxable corporations, such as provincial and territorial Crown corporations, corporations owned by municipalities or indigenous communities, and pension investment corporations.

[*English*]

In addition to the implementation of the clean electricity investment tax credit, Bill C-15 proposes enhancements to the existing suite of ITCs to ensure that they remain competitive and effective in attracting projects and high-paying careers to Canada. These include the carbon capture, utilization and storage investment tax credit, which would maintain 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. As well, the critical mineral exploration tax credit would be expanded to cover 12 more critical minerals necessary for defence, semiconductors, energy and clean technologies.

[*Translation*]

This generational budget is designed to bring about generational change.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Generational challenges would include shifting trade relationships and supply chains, climate change and housing. Canada, like many countries, is facing a steep housing supply gap, one that threatens affordability, opportunity and the ability for Canadians to build a life and a future here at home.

*[Translation]*

Canada is facing a steep housing supply gap, one that threatens affordability, opportunity and the ability for Canadians to build a life and a future here at home.

● (1325)

*[English]*

Canadians demand immediate action, and we are delivering with the urgency that the moment requires, with bold actions to unlock supply and bring affordability back within reach. From eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on homes under \$1 million to launching Build Canada Homes, a new federal agency that will drive investment and public-private co-operation, we will build faster and smarter.

With the passing of Bill C-15, Build Canada Homes would be supported by an investment of \$13 billion to help double the number of affordable homes built over the next decade. That is not all we plan to build.

Budget 2025 is about generational investment in our infrastructure and our future. That is why proposed legislative changes are included in Bill C-15 that would accelerate the development of the Alto high-speed rail project, a project that could create 51,000 jobs during construction and inject up to \$35 billion into our GDP, with a target of 25 million tonnes in emissions savings.

These amendments would enact a new act that would streamline approvals for the high-speed rail project, remove regulatory burden and eliminate duplication of effort, in order to reduce the cost and timeline to build the project.

This measure would go beyond what is possible under the Building Canada Act by allowing the project to be advanced as separate segments under the Impact Assessment Act and by adding flexibilities to the expropriation process and reservation or priority sale of lands to reduce acquisition costs.

*[Translation]*

Budget 2025 makes generational investments while maintaining Canada's strong fiscal advantage. This foundation allows us to invest ambitiously and responsibly and make the Canadian economy the strongest in the G7. We cannot control what other nations do, but we can control what we build.

That is why Canada is transforming its economy from dependence to resilience. Now is the time to make generational investments.

*[English]*

That is why I wish to encourage all members of the House to join me in supporting the passage of this crucial piece of legislation, which would help ensure that our workers and businesses will pros-

per by building Canada's strength at home and our economy for Canadians and by Canadians.

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I noticed that the most recently released public accounts show that the government increased debt maintenance, payments for interest on its debt, by 13%, or \$6 billion, over the previous year. The increase to health care transfers for the province was just \$2.6 billion, or 4.7%.

I wonder if the member could comment on why the government's policies have led the country to spend so much more in increases to interest payments than help for health care transfers.

*[Translation]*

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, right now, it is all about building. We are investing in the future of Canadians. We have a duty in this House to invest in the future of young Canadians. That is exactly what we are doing with this budget.

**Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ):** Madam Speaker, it is really something to hear the government say what a fantastic budget this is for the environment when, internationally, nearly 2,000 NGOs gathered at the UN climate conference gave it the fossil of the day award, an environmental booby prize, for its constant backsliding, including in this budget. Funds for electric vehicle incentives, the tree-planting initiative and the emissions cap in the oil and gas sector are gone, gone, gone. The government has no plan to meet its 2030 greenhouse gas reduction target either.

How can my colleague say that this budget is an environmental winner when it is being roundly described as a very alarming step backward?

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, yes, we still have work ahead in the fight against climate change. However, this budget provides funds for the youth climate corps. We are also working on Canada's new climate competitiveness strategy. Our efforts to ensure that our environmental initiatives move forward also continue. We are going to work in collaboration with all of our colleagues in the House to make things better, because there is always room for improvement.

● (1330)

*[English]*

**Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I want to ask my colleague to expand a bit more on the investment in the next generation of young people and particularly on the youth climate corps.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, this budget includes several investments for young people, including in the Canada summer jobs program, the federal student work experience program and the youth climate corps.

These investments, totalling nearly \$1 billion, will provide young people with green jobs and help support our communities, helping young people find work in these tough times.

**Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC):** Madam Speaker, this budget seems to be oddly aligned with Brookfield's investment policies.

Could the member ease my concerns?

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, our government is investing in Canadians. That is what we are doing, and that is what we will continue to do. We will work with Canadians and for Canadians. I hope the member will join us in working for Canadians.

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, we are a new government and we are presenting a new budget. As my colleagues opposite can see, this is a completely new government.

My colleague talked about the need to invest in young people and the importance of this new budget. Can she explain what impact this budget will have in Quebec?

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, the major projects office will enable us to get several, very useful projects off the ground that will create good jobs in Quebec. I am thinking in particular of mines and the high-speed rail project, which will enable many people to travel across the country. This will allow Quebecers to discover the country. It will create jobs and help us reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

That is just part of what this budget does for Quebecers. There is even more.

[*English*]

**Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC):** Madam Speaker, part of the justification for this generational debt binge by the Liberal government is the sorry state of our trade relationship with our most important trading partner: the United States. Just yesterday, when asked a question about whether he was speaking with the President, the Prime Minister said, "Who cares?... I'll speak to him again when it matters."

Does the member opposite agree with the Prime Minister that it does not really matter whether we are negotiating with the United States or not, who cares and we will get to it when it is important?

[*Translation*]

**Tatiana Auguste:** Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister and his team are talking to our U.S. counterparts. I know that we are diversifying our supply chains. We are making investments elsewhere. We are also making the country much more resilient.

That is what we are focusing on.

**Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation act, a document that should reflect the government's true pri-

orities and stand as an exercise in rigour, transparency and accountability. Once again, sadly, that is not what we have before us.

The budget is traditionally tabled in the spring. This year, in a completely unwarranted move, the Liberals decided to table it in the fall. They promised a fresh start, a new way of doing things. They even pilfered a few Conservative ideas to try to pretty up their plan and make it more appealing to voters. With the Liberals, however, the more things change, the more they stay the same. This budget does not offer a fresh start. It is just a continuation of the past 10 years of out-of-control spending, chronic deficits and haphazard management. The projected deficit for this year is \$78.3 billion. That is the largest in Canadian history, not counting the massive pandemic-era deficits.

Here again, the Liberals' projections are usually about as reliable as the weather forecast for a month from now. Cost overruns have become a tradition, if not a Liberal hallmark. The amounts they announce are astronomical to begin with, but Canadians know that, as usual, they will balloon even more. Every billion adds to the burden on future generations and, while the Liberals continue with their wasteful spending, it is our children and grandchildren who will have to foot the bill.

In an attempt to conceal the scope of the problem, the government has come up with some new accounting sleight of hand. Its latest gimmick is separating operational spending from so-called investment spending so it can claim that it will be able to balance the budget one day in some imaginary future. In other words, it decided that part of what it spends is no longer spending. By changing the way the math works, it magically made the state of Canada's public finances appear less catastrophic than it really is. This is what we call creative accounting, but it is so creative that it may eventually create problems for the Liberals.

Canadians do not have that luxury. Canadian households do not have that privilege. When a family makes a budget, they do not have the freedom to decide that certain expenses do not count. They have to live within their means. When they buy a house, they know it is an investment, of course, but that does not change the fact that they will have to pay for it, that the mortgage has to be reasonable and that their income has to keep pace. This government, however, acts as though money grows on the trees behind the Parliament buildings. It refuses to acknowledge that today's choices have a real, tangible and unavoidable impact on tomorrow's taxpayers.

*Government Orders*

I am not alone in calling out this creative accounting. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, Jason Jacques, whom the Liberals want to send packing and whom I commend for his impartiality and rigour, expressed the major concerns he has. His report on the budget recommends establishing an independent expert body to determine what might reasonably be considered an investment expenditure according to objective criteria. He said this because the definition chosen by the Liberals is subjective, malleable and overly expansive. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, whom the Liberals are trying to get rid of in short order, noted that the government categorizes a wide range of expenses, some of which relate to business tax credits, operating subsidies and permanent tax measures, as capital investments.

That just does not wash. Even the U.K. model, which served as inspiration for the Prime Minister, does not include such measures. Applying objective criteria, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, whom the Liberals hope to fire a few days from now, estimates that the expenses characterized as investments are in some cases overstated by more than \$20 billion. That is not a little mistake, that is major manipulation. This difference clearly shows that the government is attempting to hide day-to-day operating costs beneath a veneer of investment. In reality, this is simply additional spending on the government credit card that will drive up the deficit.

• (1335)

Let us also talk about how others are looking at our situation. Credit rating agencies are scrutinizing our finances. They are looking at our budget trends, our fiscal credibility, and our ability to bring spending under control. They are concerned about what they have observed in recent years, just as much as economists and financial institutions in the country are concerned.

Canada was once a beacon of fiscal discipline. It had an enviable reputation for its capacity to balance budgets, rein in debt, and provide a stable and predictable financial environment. This reputation is now fading. A loss of international credibility has tangible consequences, including higher borrowing costs for the government, families facing higher rates, less flexibility for investing in actual needs, and lower investor confidence. All these things will chip away at Canada's economic resilience.

What are families going through while the Liberals are spending recklessly? Their grocery prices are constantly on the increase, rents and mortgages are skyrocketing, day-to-day expenses are exceeding their income, and they are feeling more tax pressure year in, year out. This budget has not addressed these concerns. It does not offer any plan to make life affordable. It is not tackling inflation. It does not promote prudent fiscal management. In fact, it is adding more fuel to the fire.

We are dealing with a Prime Minister who calls himself an economist, but he is driving this country into a wall. The Prime Minister likes to talk about the fact that he is a former governor of the Bank of Canada, but his time there does not appear to have had a long-standing impact on his ability to manage public finances. He is now acting more like the prime minister of a bankrupt Canada than a responsible head of government. This may not be an enviable title, but unfortunately, that is the title he is in the process of acquiring.

Conservatives have a clear approach: we have to live within Canada's means, protect taxpayers' money, cut wasteful spending, promote actual economic growth, put an end to chronic deficits, and most importantly, put the fiscal house back in order. We know that a country cannot spend more than it makes indefinitely. We know that today's deficits are tomorrow's taxes. We know that prosperity cannot be decreed: It is built through work, innovation, private investment, and a stable and predictable economic environment. Our proposals make sense, they are realistic, and they respect taxpayers.

I cannot help but conclude by reminding members about the Prime Minister's world tour, which has not brought down any of the tariffs imposed by our trading partners. While the Prime Minister is gallivanting around the world, we may well wonder whether he is defending the interests of small and medium-sized Canadian businesses or the interests of Brookfield.

On that note, I would like to point to the convergence of the budget's orientations with Brookfield's own, a company that manages assets of over \$1 trillion. Like the government, this firm has their hands just about everywhere. The Prime Minister was still with Brookfield just before he threw his hat into the Liberal leadership race back in January, seeing as he resigned from the company on January 16.

Brookfield has investment projects in minerals, petroleum, housing, the railway sector, carbon capture, clean energy, the nuclear industry, data storage, and artificial intelligence. All these projects have restrictions. In this budget, we can see that the government wants to loosen these restrictions. Some would say that this is a coincidence. I would call this overlapping interests between a powerful global investment fund and a government whose Prime Minister worked for this fund just a few days before getting into politics.

The fact that the Prime Minister was well familiar with Brookfield's orientation is an open secret that becomes apparent upon going through the budget page by page and seeing the overlapping areas. This budget is neither responsible, nor transparent, nor is it credible. It conceals expenditure and makes excuses. It saddles future generations with debt. It threatens Canada's economic stability. It shows contempt for Canadian families which have to balance their budget at the end of the month.

The government could have done better. It ought to have done better. Instead, once again, it chose the easy way out: spend, borrow, and hope no one would look at the numbers too closely.

• (1340)

We will keep a close eye on those figures. The Conservatives will continue to stand up for the interests of Canadian families, to speak out against questionable practices and to work for an affordable budget for an affordable life, because Canadians deserve better and because the country's future depends on it.

*Government Orders*

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am really disappointed to hear my colleague talking about investments without understanding what is being said. When a person invests in a home, they pay for it. They have a mortgage. I take care of my home. I mow the lawn. I make repairs. I can even change the way it looks from the outside. I invest in my home to increase its value.

We have introduced a budget that includes investments to reduce the deficit. Members across the way voted against this budget. How can my colleague rise today to say that this budget does not include any investments?

• (1345)

**Jacques Gourde:** Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind my colleague that, according to an international convention, budgets must include all expenditures for every single year. When a government spends money, it must include those expenditures in the budget. If Canada changes the rules, we are changing the whole way things are done internationally. As a result, our budget will no longer have any credibility and it will no longer be considered by rating agencies. Members can guess what will happen after that.

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Madam Speaker, we completely agree that the attempts to pass off spending as investment in the budget is all smoke and mirrors. Can my colleague give us other examples of spending that is billed as investment?

**Jacques Gourde:** Madam Speaker, I will go a step further.

I just came from a meeting of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics. The committee just heard from Brookfield officials, who actually said in committee that the Prime Minister had deferred shares, meaning that he had a stock certificate in his back pocket when he left Brookfield, one for which he will receive payment in 10 years. When the government invests in companies that Brookfield funds, we can only imagine what the Prime Minister will be able to collect.

[*English*]

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Madam Speaker, we saw the previous finance minister quit the government because she said that what turned out to be a \$36-billion deficit from last year was so fiscally irresponsible. The current finance minister then dropped a budget with a \$78-billion deficit.

What does it say about the current finance minister? He says this is something Canadians would celebrate, when the previous finance minister quit over the financial irresponsibility of a \$36-billion deficit.

[*Translation*]

**Jacques Gourde:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his interesting question, but I have my doubts about what the Minister of Finance was able to choose in his own budget. Put simply, I am not even sure that he wrote the budget himself. However, he is a good communicator, I will give him that. He repeats the Prime Minister's Office's messaging.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised to hear my colleague say that he voted against the budget, especially given that there are several projects that will have a direct and significant impact on Que-

bec's economy, which is the province he represents in the House. I am specifically thinking about the Contrecoeur container terminal project, the eastern energy partnership and the Alto high-frequency rail project in the Quebec City-Toronto corridor, which will have a direct impact on the region my colleague represents.

Why is my colleague opposed to projects that will have a significant impact on the economy of the province he represents in the House?

**Jacques Gourde:** Madam Speaker, I am extremely pleased to respond to my colleague.

I will have the good fortune of welcoming my eighth grandchild in April. Babies often cry when they come into the world, and there will be a good reason for this one to cry: He will owe the federal government \$35,000 from the moment he is born. That is why I voted against the budget.

**Mario Beaulieu:** Madam Speaker, I am guessing that my colleague has a number of seniors in his riding, as I do.

Does he think that the government should increase pensions for those aged 65 to 74, as it did a few years ago for people aged 75 and over?

**Jacques Gourde:** Madam Speaker, unfortunately, the government refused to increase their pension. The government has left our country in a sorry financial state, and the entire community, all Canadians, will have to pay for that.

**Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to budget initiatives that will have a positive effect on my constituents, the people of Compton—Stanstead in the Eastern Townships. Compton—Stanstead is a wonderful region that extends from Lake Memphremagog to Mont-Mégantic. It shares a border with the United States and includes a good part of the city of Sherbrooke.

It is a very diverse region. I have travelled around my riding in recent weeks, and many people have had good things to say to me about the budget. They are very optimistic about this budget and they are grateful for what it will do for communities in our area.

Border communities are so close to the United States, and the people there are concerned about the economic uncertainty resulting from our relationship with the U.S. That is creating instability for businesses and for families living on both sides of the border. People really want to see initiatives that will make us a little less dependent on the United States. They want to see more economic activity in Canada and they want people who are still struggling with the inflation we have been experiencing in recent years to have a little breathing room. I think that, in this budget, people are seeing measures that will help us protect ourselves, become more resilient, increase our development and support the population.

### *Government Orders*

That is what I am hearing back home, and I am happy about it. I am also very pleased with the investments made possible in my region. Businesses will be able to keep growing because of what is in the budget. For the next few minutes, that is what I want to talk about. I want to talk about investments that are important for our businesses, such as issuing government contracts, developing new markets, launching major projects and investing in the defence sector. For individuals, we have announced income tax cuts. We are also going to make it easier to access benefits, reduce certain fees and help improve access to housing. In addition, we are going to help municipalities invest in housing and infrastructure in collaboration with the Government of Quebec, of course.

In my view, this budget tackles current economic challenges while laying the foundation for the future. The goal is to become increasingly resilient and to be proactive in dealing with the challenges that will arise in the future, because we know that we are facing a profoundly changing and increasingly uncertain world. This calls for certainty and long-term projections. I think the investments in the budget will enable us to work for a long time and develop our economy, as I said earlier. With this budget, our government is choosing economic resilience, productivity and Canadian sovereignty.

I would like to begin by talking about people. The people in my region are very happy that we are cutting taxes for 22 million Canadians. For a couple, that is a saving of up to \$840 with a simple tax cut on the lowest tax bracket. This is a measure that people back home are very happy about. It allows for some breathing room, so to speak, in budgets that are sometimes very tight. We are also going to eliminate the GST for first-time homebuyers on homes up to \$1 million. Where I come from, this measure will benefit most first-time buyers. For many young people, this investment will make home ownership more accessible.

Unfortunately, my region is also one that has lost some of its vitality. In some places, there are larger pockets of poverty. We are going to make benefits automatic for lower-income individuals. This measure will target people who think they are not entitled to government benefits because, with no tax to pay, they do not file their tax returns. These people are missing out on important benefits like the Canada child benefit. They may be missing out on the Canadian dental care plan or seniors' benefits. Automatic tax filing will enable these people to receive financial benefits that will help them make ends meet.

We are also going to work to reduce certain banking fees. In some cases, we are seeing a rapid rise in banking fees. We are going to bring down some of these fees, a measure that will also be very welcome.

• (1350)

The mayor of Martinville will be very pleased to note that we are working on cellular connectivity. Michel-Henri Goyette is a key partner when it comes to cellular connectivity in the regions.

We are making investments, and we will continue taking action to expand cellphone coverage.

The CRTC says that 99% of Canadians are connected to the cellular network. That would mean that the other 1% all live in my rid-

ing. However, some of my colleagues from the regions might disagree. Everyone thinks their riding has that 1%.

In short, we must continue to improve cellular connectivity in the regions, and that is what this budget does. New steps are being taken to provide cellular connectivity to the people in my region. I see this not only as an economic issue, but also as a safety issue, because emergency services must have access to cell service in an emergency situation. It is also a simple matter of fairness between people in the regions and people in urban centres, who generally enjoy much better access to cellular services.

I would also like to talk about what this budget is doing for businesses. That is where the largest share of investment is going. I have had many telephone conversations with people from chambers of commerce and business owners who are very pleased with what the budget has to offer. This budget will really help them make investments to increase productivity through the productivity super-education. Businesses will be able to reduce or write off all of their investments right from the first year. This will make Canada extremely competitive with other G7 members because it already has a very advantageous tax regime in this area. Canada is enhancing its position through this accelerated investment incentive.

Many large projects have also been launched. Although no major project is coming to Compton—Stanstead, the investments will create opportunities for many small businesses in regions like mine that are located outside major urban centres to partner with projects associated with the large investments that will be rolled out in the coming years. This is somewhat similar to the buy Canadian policy. Ensuring that the Canadian government becomes the top client for Canadian businesses or includes them in its contracts will give local businesses access to this type of contracts.

The budget is doing the same thing with defence procurement. Procurement in general and defence procurement in particular will provide contract opportunities in regions like mine. I was with the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement just two weeks ago and we met with some 40 business representatives from the Eastern Townships, from large businesses like Cascades and BRP to many smaller businesses like PPD Group and Laboratoire M2. We discussed how to ensure that small and medium-sized businesses in the regions can avail themselves of these contracts. The discussions were very meaningful and rewarding for the entrepreneurs, who will be ready to participate as soon as the government unveils the contracts. Businesses will be ready to participate in and benefit from these investments, which will boost the economy and create good, well-paying jobs in my neck of the woods. That is great news for people in my riding. We had a great meeting.

Late last week, my colleague from Brome—Missisquoi, my colleague from Sherbrooke and I met with people from three niche manufacturing sectors that are very well represented in our region. They operate in what I would call “primary” sectors, namely rubber, textiles and electronics. We met with around 60 entrepreneurs from across Quebec, and the discussions we had with all of them were similar. The people on the ground say that they are very pleased with what the government is doing to support economic growth in our region.

I had a very fruitful discussion with the new mayor of Sherbrooke, who was my predecessor in this place. I want to take a moment to congratulate Marie-Claude Bibeau on being elected mayor of Sherbrooke. I had an excellent discussion with Ms. Bibeau about the investments that the government plans to make to help the municipalities build housing and establish community centres and sports facilities.

• (1355)

There are some really significant investments. I hope we will reach an agreement with Quebec quickly so that money can go out to support the municipalities.

I believe that our budget will meet the needs of the people of Compton—Stanstead and people throughout the Eastern Townships. I look forward to the opposition supporting us in implementing the budget.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

### GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

**Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, November 25 marks the start of 16 days of activism against gender-based violence. This moment is supposed to be about moving beyond talk and delivering real action, yet once again, the federal government has provided zero dollars in this year's budget to address the crisis of missing and murdered indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ people, even after the former prime minister recognized this violence as an ongoing genocide.

In Winnipeg Centre, women, girls and gender-diverse people continue to go missing and be murdered. This is not a crisis we can acknowledge only in words; it demands immediate investment and urgent political will. The Liberal government must act now. That begins with funding life-saving community supports, such as the North End Women's Centre in Winnipeg, and providing the resources indigenous women and gender diverse people have been calling for for decades.

Our communities deserve safety, dignity and justice. Action must start today.

### Statements by Members

#### CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an important moment that speaks to the deep and historic trade ties between Canada and Europe.

On November 7, in Pasaia, within the Basque country in Spain, the *San Juan*, a fully reconstructed 16th century Basque galleon, was launched with plans to sail it to Canada in 2027.

The original *San Juan* was part of the transatlantic trade network linking Pasaia with Red Bay, Labrador, now a UNESCO world heritage site. This trade, among the earliest between Europe and North America, carried not only goods, such as whale oil and lumber, but also knowledge, technology and partnership. The voyage of the *San Juan* reminds us that Labrador has long been a gateway of commerce and co-operation between countries.

As Canada continues to strengthen its modern trade relationships with Europe, we can look to our shared maritime history for inspiration. The *San Juan* stands as a powerful symbol of the enduring economic and cultural connections that continue to unite Canada and Europe across the Atlantic.

\* \* \*

#### CHARITABLE GIVING IN BARRIE SOUTH—INNISFIL

**John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as we begin the Christmas season, it is important to remember the spirit of giving and compassion that defines the time of year.

In Barrie and Innisfil, local charities, such as Community for Kids, Christmas Cheer, Senior Wish Association, the Salvation Army, our local churches and the Rotary clubs, work tirelessly to support families, provide meals and bring hope to those in need.

Food banks in both Barrie and Innisfil have seen a demand increase and a rise in use. Speaking with Barrie Food Bank executive director Karen Shuh over the weekend, I learned that it has seen a 16% increase in usage year over year. Sadly, people who never imagined they would have to use the food bank now are. The same is true in Innisfil.

By donating or volunteering, we can make a real difference in the lives of our neighbours and strengthen the bonds that make our communities so special. This Christmas, let us come together to share kindness and ensure that everyone can experience the joy of the season.

\* \* \*

#### GUELPH NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

**Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Guelph's newest Nobel laureate, economist Dr. Peter Howitt. Born and raised in Guelph, he earned the 2025 Nobel Prize in Economics for his groundbreaking model of creative destruction, developed with Philippe Aghion.

*Statements by Members*

Dr. Peter Howitt's path began at Victory Public School and then Guelph CVI, amazingly the same path as Dr. Donna Strickland, 2018 Nobel laureate in physics and the third woman in history to earn that honour. Guelph's Nobel roster also boasts Dr. David Card, Nobel laureate in economics in 2021 and graduate of John F. Ross CVI; Dr. James Orbinski led Médecins Sans Frontières when it received the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1999; and this fall, Dr. Paul Hebert of the University of Guelph earned the Nobel Sustainability Trust Award for his pioneering work as the founder of DNA bar-coding.

From local classrooms to global acclaim, Guelph and Canada could not be prouder. These brilliant minds remind us that, when we invest in education, we invest in world-changing ideas.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, I have travelled across Canada on a “jail not bail” town hall tour listening to thousands of Canadians pour out their fear and frustration.

Everywhere I go, Canadians say the same thing: They no longer trust their justice system. Who can blame them? Criminals are laughing at law enforcement, knowing they will be arrested in the morning and back on the street by lunch. There is no deterrence, no consequence and no accountability because the Liberal government took it all away.

That is why I launched a national petition to strengthen our laws to keep violent, repeat offenders behind bars. Over 66,000 Canadians responded, demanding safety and real consequences. If the Liberals truly cared about ending the crime crisis they created, they would repeal the principle of restraint, restore mandatory minimums and support Conservatives' jail not bail act. Anything less is a choice to either stand with the criminals or prioritize community safety.

\* \* \*

● (1405)

[*Translation*]

**ANDRÉ GENEST**

**Tim Watchorn (Les Pays-d'en-Haut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to honour André Genest's 35 years of community service. Born in Wentworth-Nord in Les Pays-d'en-Haut, André spent his life serving everyone in his community. In addition to his career in municipal government, he worked as an educator in a youth centre and even welcomed into his home children who were homeless and lacked hope.

He was elected as a municipal councillor in 1990 and served six terms as mayor of Wentworth-Nord and two terms as reeve of Les Pays-d'en-Haut RCM, directly elected by the people, from 2017 to 2025. He also represented the 1,050 municipalities of the Fédération québécoise des municipalités on the board of directors.

Although André successfully managed a number of major projects during his career, I am confident that the sports complex is the one he is most proud of. He brought together nine municipali-

ties around a \$45-million collective project, which will be his legacy for future generations.

After 35 years of service, his last day as an elected official was November 2. I would like to wish my friend André, on my own behalf and on behalf of the members of the House, a happy retirement.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**WORLD JUNIOR HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP**

**Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there is big news for Red Deer as the 51st IIHF World Junior Championship is returning to Alberta. The World Junior is not just a hockey tournament; it is where legends are born, such as “Sid the Kid”, Connor McDavid and the next generation of superstars. These young talents light up the ice.

The last time Red Deer hosted was all the way back in 1995, and Canada won gold. Now, over 30 years later, we are bringing hockey back to the heartland to chase gold. Fourteen thrilling games will be played at the Marchant Crane Centrium. Let us pack the stands in red and white, cheer on team Canada and show the world our central Albertan hospitality. I know our boys will battle it out, skate fast and shoot hard. The future of hockey is coming to Red Deer. I will see everyone at the rink in 2027.

Go, Canada, go!

\* \* \*

**350TH ANNIVERSARY OF GURU TEGH BAHADUR**

**Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today marks the 350th anniversary of the martyrdom of ninth Sikh guru, Guru Tegh Bahadur Sahib Ji, a towering figure not only in Sikh history but also in the history of humanity. His supreme sacrifice to defend freedom of conscience and to protect the rights of those persecuted is a timeless lesson in moral courage.

Long before the world spoke of universal human rights, Guru Tegh Bahadur Sahib Ji stood firmly for equality, justice and inter-faith solidarity. His legacy is a reminder that the strength of Canada is rooted in these very values. Today, we honour his memory and reaffirm our commitment to safeguarding human rights and religious freedom for all.

### BEEKEEPING

**Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as the MP for the honey capital of Canada, I am pleased to rise today to celebrate Canada's bees and their beekeepers.

Canada's beekeeping industry operates over 800,000 colonies, pollinating 75% of our food and feed crops. From wild blueberries in Cape Breton to the yellow canola seas of Peace River country and the apple orchards of B.C. and Quebec, the map that we eat is drawn by the mighty bee. These tiny marvels, with their tireless buzz, carry tomorrow's harvest through the skies.

When winter bites, and when faced with habitat loss and varroa mites, Canada's 10,000 beekeepers rise to the occasion with skill, grit and determination to deliver the world's best tasting honey and food to our tables. Every jar of honey is a small victory, every pollinated field a bountiful blessing, and every beekeeper a patriot in a veil. To our beekeepers here today, the quiet backbone of our food security, and on behalf of a grateful nation, we express our thanks.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

### MADELEINE POULIN

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this weekend, we learned of the death of the great journalist Madeleine Poulin. Originally, she was not interested in journalism as a career. In fact, she wanted to teach.

In the end, that is what she did. Through her professionalism, she ensured that generations of Quebecers and francophones across Canada were better educated on social issues, politics and current events in general. In short, she helped make all of us better citizens who are better informed and better equipped to participate in democratic life.

Through her diligence, she raised the bar for all news professionals in every TV, radio and newspaper newsroom. Through her determination, she inspired dozens of women to get involved in the demanding career of journalism, just as she was inspired by the great Judith Jasmin, with whom she now shares the title of pioneer.

Through her example, Madeleine Poulin taught us to stay curious, to stick to the facts and, perhaps before her time, to seek out and protect reliable and honest sources of information. Ms. Poulin will continue to inspire not only women, but all those who embark on a career in journalism as fiercely as she did.

\* \* \*

[English]

### GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

**Wade Chang (Burnaby Central, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on November 25, we observe the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women, a reminder that gender-based violence continues to threaten women, girls and gender diverse people across Canada, and on November 27, we mark the eighth anniversary of the historic apology delivered to 2SLGBTQI+ Canadians, an affirmation that equality, dignity and inclusion must guide us always.

### Statements by Members

Budget 2025 turns that premise into action with over \$660 million over five years to advance women's equality, support 2SLGBTQI+ Canadians and expand Canada's fight against gender-based violence. To Emma, an openly queer student from Burnaby Central who wrote to me urging that we keep fighting for the most vulnerable, who still face discrimination and harassment simply because of who they are, on this side of the house, we hear them, we see them and we will defend their rights every single day.

\* \* \*

### COST OF FOOD

**Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive government in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, and the Liberals are the ones driving up the cost of everything. Food prices are up 3.4% this year, and they are rising 40% faster here than in the United States. Canadians cannot stretch their paycheques any further.

Parents are struggling just to put food on the table, and food insecurity has reached truly alarming levels, but when the Liberals had a chance to lower food costs, they refused. Instead, the Prime Minister is pouring fuel on the fire with a deficit of \$78 billion, and he is hiking the industrial carbon tax, yet another hidden food tax. These increased input costs make groceries even more expensive for Canadians. It is time to scrap the hidden taxes and make groceries affordable again.

\* \* \*

### DONALD EDMUND GRAVES

**Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the passing of one of Canada's great military historians, my stepfather, Donald Edmund Graves. Don served as a military historian with the Government of Canada before later founding his own firm and advising governments, private organizations and filmmakers in Britain and North America. He was the author or editor of nearly two dozen books on many topics, but his greatest passion was the War of 1812. As Canada's leading expert on that conflict, which defined our country so early on, Don advised the U.S., Canadian and British governments for the war's bicentennial celebrations in 2012.

*Statements by Members*

From Don, I learned a love of history and strategy, as well as deep respect for the women and men who wear Canada's uniform. I also gained a lifelong appreciation for the importance of good friends, country living and a family dog. It is fitting that such a great military historian died on Remembrance Day, and today I extend my condolences to Don's son, Matthew, and his extended family, friends and colleagues in the military history community. His contributions will be missed but never forgotten.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a good day to be Brookfield, the Prime Minister's former company, under the Liberal government. Its latest treat is a \$500-million contract for the European Space Agency to create good-paying jobs in Europe, but it gets better, as 50% of the Harwell campus, where the European Space Agency is located, is owned by Brookfield.

Let us not forget that Brookfield is Canada's number one tax-dodger. Through various shell corporations in the Caribbean, it avoided paying \$6.5 billion in taxes. Meanwhile, 2.2 million Canadians line up at food banks every single month, and the unemployment rate is 6.9%. The government's answer is to make Brookfield richer.

Conservatives will not stop. Every single day, we will expose this kind of corruption, and every single day, we will fight to make sure it stops.

\* \* \*

● (1415)

[Translation]

**JOCELYNE BATES AND LISE POISSANT**

**Jacques Ramsay (La Prairie—Atateken, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to two women who have left their mark on municipal life in my riding of La Prairie—Atateken.

Jocelyne Bates was first elected as a councillor for Sainte-Catherine in 1990 and then went on to serve as mayor for 31 consecutive years. She was also the first woman to hold the position of reeve of the Roussillon RCM. Lise Poissant served as a councillor for Saint-Mathieu for 10 years and then served as mayor for two decades.

Both women represent public service at its best: selfless, ever-present, consistent, legendarily generous and unfailingly honest. Both have helped their towns grow into orderly, green, inclusive places.

On behalf of myself and all the citizens of La Prairie—Atateken, I would like to thank Jocelyne and Lise for their dedication, vision and service. Sainte-Catherine and Saint-Mathieu are deeply indebted to them.

[English]

**CANADA-U.S. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS**

**Colin Reynolds (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister campaigned on the concerns of Canadians regarding the trade war with the United States. He even billed himself as a so-called master negotiator who would secure a deal with President Trump by July 21 of this year. When asked this past weekend about the progress of the trade negotiations, he replied, "Who cares?" Well, I care and the hard-working men and women of Elmwood—Transcona care.

We have seen tons of good-paying Canadian jobs flee to the United States following Trump's tariff threats. Is the Prime Minister prepared to look workers in the eye and tell them he does not care about their livelihoods? Canadians deserve a more urgent approach at the negotiating table. I urge the Prime Minister to take these trade negotiations seriously and stand up for Canada.

Conservatives stand ready to deal with President Trump and take the trade war seriously, because we do care about Canadians.

\* \* \*

**YOUNG PEOPLE IN CANADA**

**Jake Sawatzky (New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, young people will build our future. We need them to. We do not have an option. Our country will be relying on them, so it is critical that they have the supports they need.

I say to young Canadians that their voice matters and they are valued. I encourage them to be clear and organized about their priorities and to become leaders in areas they are passionate about.

The young generation brings a refreshing perspective to politics. I am happy that today we are joined by members of the Young Politicians of Canada, which plays an important role in shaping youth-centred policy around the world.

The House of Commons represents all Canadians. That means it needs to represent young people and the problems they face, whether that is working toward home ownership, addressing climate change, supporting higher education or navigating how AI will affect our world. These are concerns that are critical to address if we want to see our new generation thrive.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS***[Translation]***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister got elected by claiming that the U.S. tariffs were an existential threat for Canada. However, this weekend, journalists asked him whether talks were ongoing. He said that there are no issues of importance to discuss. In fact, he said, “Who cares?” He does not care. He does not care about aluminum workers and forestry workers.

Is that really his message to the workers in Quebec hit hard by the tariffs: who cares?

• (1420)

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies repeated MAGA-style accusations that immigrants are slowing down the Canadian economy. Things are starting to go off the rails on that side. I think Canadians have a right to know whether the Leader of the Opposition agrees with these comments.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the question was for the Prime Minister. Yesterday, he was asked a question about workers' jobs in the forestry, aluminum, steel and other sectors. These workers are suffering because of the Prime Minister's failures at the bargaining table and his broken promises. He replied:

*[English]*

“Who cares?”

*[Translation]*

Why does the Prime Minister not care that people in Beauce, Saguenay and elsewhere in Canada are losing their jobs because of his failures? Why did he say:

*[English]*

“Who cares?”

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, these are serious matters the member is talking about.

*[English]*

I just want to repeat this. Last week, the member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies repeated MAGA claims that immigration and immigrants are a drag on the Canadian economy. I think Canadians want to know from the Leader of the Opposition—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** Order. Let us take a little pause and let the noise level drop a bit.

The government House leader may continue.

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, the member repeated MAGA claims that immigrants are a drag on our economy.

I think Canadians want to know whether the Leader of the Opposition approves of this kind of language. Will he sanction the member, yes or no?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claimed during the last election that U.S. tariffs were an existential crisis requiring that he immediately be elected to negotiate a win and get a deal by July 21. Well, a few days ago, he was asked about the state of those negotiations, and he said there are no issues of importance to discuss. In fact, he said, “Who cares?”

We care. We care about the workers who have lost their jobs and do not have paycheques to make their mortgage payments. Why does he not care?

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we think that things are starting to go off the rails on the other side.

*[English]*

A member's repeating of MAGA claims came in the wake of the member for Calgary Midnapore questioning the Prime Minister's loyalty to Canada.

I think we can all agree that those are comments that no Canadian can take seriously. My question is, does the Leader of the Opposition take them seriously? If he does not, which he must surely not, would he tell the House, and then would he tell his member to apologize for those comments?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister already apologized to President Trump. It was one of the many areas where he backed down and capitulated after claiming that he would be elbows up.

He promised he would have a deal by July 21; there was no deal. He promised to negotiate a win; there were no wins. He promised elbows up; elbows are gone.

Now when he is asked about the state of the talks, he says, “Who cares?” Why should he care? Days after he met with the President, Brookfield got an \$80-billion contract with the White House. Is that really what he cares about? Does he not care about the hard-working Canadians who are counting on him to keep his promise?

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, of course, the Prime Minister cares about the well-being of Canada, of workers and of our industries. That is why we are engaged in constructive negotiations with the United States, but Canadians feel like things are starting to go off the rails on the other side.

*Oral Questions*

In the House this morning, the member for Calgary Midnapore once again questioned the Prime Minister's loyalty to Canada. Does the Leader of the Opposition condone these comments? If not, will he admonish his member?

[*English*]

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is the Prime Minister who said, "Who cares?" when he was asked over the weekend about the failure to keep his promises on trade. Since he took office, not only has he failed to get the promised deal, but American tariffs on aluminum, autos and steel have doubled. On forestry communities, they have tripled.

The Prime Minister says, "Who cares?" All of us on this side of the House care about the communities that are being emptied out, like those in forestry and the steelworkers in Hamilton who do not have jobs to pay their mortgages. We care about those people. Why does he not?

• (1425)

**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, just because the Leader of the Opposition keeps repeating the same line over and over again, that does not make it real.

The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that our government was elected to defend Canadian workers and the Canadian economy. That is exactly what we did in the budget that was tabled in the House of Commons. The opposition decided not to support Canadian workers, provinces, territories and sectors under attack by unfair American tariffs.

We are going to continue to support Canadian workers and the Canadian economy and negotiate a deal with the United States.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, he said, "and negotiate a deal with the United States." He repeats the same promise that the Prime Minister has been breaking for the last eight months.

He said he would have a deal by July 21; there is no deal. He said he would negotiate a win; there is no win. He said he would not back down; all he has done is back down. He said he would be elbows up; his elbows are missing. Now when he is asked about the fate of the thousands of jobs that rely on him keeping his word, he says, "Who cares?"

Is it not clear by now that just days after he met the President, only Brookfield got the \$80-billion deal? Is that what he meant when he promised he would negotiate a win?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** Let us pause for a moment and bring the temperature down.

The hon. Minister of Finance and National Revenue.

[*English*]

**Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is only Monday and look how excited they are. They know there is good news in the budget. That is what I see.

There is enough good news to go to Regina, to go to Winnipeg and to go to Moose Jaw. The people in Winnipeg understand that we need to invest in infrastructure. The people in Moose Jaw understand that we need to invest in our military. The people in Regina understand that we need to invest in housing. Canadians understand that we need to invest in this country.

On this side of this House, we will always fight for Canadians, because every day is a good day to fight for Canadians.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that, following his visit to the United Arab Emirates, the Prime Minister of Canada is abandoning Canada's feminist approach to diplomacy and international relations.

Can the government confirm today that gender equality is no longer a value promoted by Canada? I can assure the House that gender equality is a Quebec value.

**Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, give me a break. I want to be clear. Canada's commitment to empowering women and girls, achieving gender equality, condemning all forms of discrimination and eliminating gender-based violence is unwavering and will never change. As the minister pointed out in her speech to the United Nations, Canada's foreign policy will be guided by three principles: defence and security, economic sovereignty and our values. Speaking of values, feminism is a core value of our government and an important part of our foreign policy.

• (1430)

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the discomfort on that side is palpable. It is like the entire team is skating backwards to make up for the Prime Minister's diplomatic blunder.

We are talking about the values of the free world, the efforts to build a better world and the powerful message being sent on the world stage. Is this not instead about pandering to the United Arab Emirates' sexist regime?

**Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just talked about values. Feminism is a core value of our government and an important part of our foreign policy. As we work to diversify our trade relationships and create opportunities for our workers, the Prime Minister has also been clear that Canada is strengthening its commitment to addressing gender-based violence and inequality at home and abroad.

*Oral Questions*

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is a perfect example of someone speaking out of both sides of their mouth. The government reels off bits of feminist rhetoric when, in fact, the message they are sending on the international stage is that Canada is no longer a country that promotes gender equality.

Coincidentally, this comes at a time when the Prime Minister is looking for tens of billions of dollars from the United Arab Emirates. Someone please explain this to me.

**Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am really trying to be clear. I want to be clear. Canada has an unwavering commitment to empowering women and girls, achieving gender equality, condemning all forms of discrimination and eliminating gender-based violence. That will never change.

The minister emphasized that point at the United Nations, and I mentioned it earlier: Canada's foreign policy will be guided by three principles, including values. Speaking of values, as I said, feminism is a fundamental value of this foreign policy.

\* \* \*

[English]

**AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY**

**Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said he was a master negotiator, and he looked our auto workers in the eye and promised a deal with the U.S., but now that he is failing, he is shrugging it off, saying that it does not matter. He said, "Who cares?", and that it is not a "burning" issue. He is wrong, because it is a burning issue for Denise, an auto worker in Oxford who is losing her job, and for thousands of others who do not know how they will make ends meet.

Why does the Prime Minister not care about the same jobs he promised he would protect?

**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, the government is actively involved with the sectors of the economy that are facing the most pressure from the unjustified 232 tariffs. This includes, obviously, auto workers. It includes workers in the steel and aluminum industries and in the softwood lumber industry.

We have already taken steps to support those workers and those businesses. My colleague should be excited that there is more good news coming in our government's effort to support those industries as we navigate through a trade circumstance Canada did not create. We are not going to sign any deal like the Leader of the Opposition—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Oxford.

**Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is actively doing absolutely nothing for our workers. He literally campaigned on getting a deal with the U.S., but now, since he is failing, he is brushing it off. He says, "Who cares?" The thousands of auto workers who are losing their jobs care. The tens of thou-

sands of spinoff workers who will not be able to pay their bills, pay their mortgage or feed their families care.

Canadians do care, so how can the Prime Minister look workers in the eye and tell them that their livelihoods are not a burning issue?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is pretty rich for the member opposite to say that he cares about people like Denise, workers who are benefiting from work-sharing, which is supporting the very auto employers he speaks about to retain a skilled workforce.

Guess what. The Conservatives voted against Denise. They voted against Canadians who are benefiting not only from the measures in budget 2025 but also from measures we have put into place since the attack on our economy. Let me be clear: We will be with workers like Denise. The Conservatives are voting against them every day.

● (1435)

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised a U.S. trade deal by July 21. He called himself a master negotiator. He failed, and now he says he does not have a burning issue to talk to the U.S. President about. Meanwhile, Windsor auto workers at Stellantis, Ford and the small businesses that supply them have a real, burning issue with layoffs, shifts being cut and a Christmas full of worry.

Will the Prime Minister look these workers in the eye and tell them their jobs and their kids' futures are not a burning issue for him?

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the government, the Minister of Industry and all of us on this side are fighting every day for those jobs in Windsor and across southwestern Ontario.

I want to read a quote from the Mayor of St. Thomas, Joe Preston. He said, "The mayor hasn't stopped smiling" and "Generations in the future can stay here, have a job that pays well enough to buy a home in St. Thomas and become part of a really vibrant community." That is thanks to new investments being made in this sector in St. Thomas and across southwestern Ontario.

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are sick of waiting. Windsor has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. Families are worried about bills, factories' being idle and a real trade war, but the Prime Minister said, "Who cares?" Conservatives care. Windsorites care.

When will the Prime Minister treat Windsor workers as if their jobs mattered, and take urgent action to protect their paycheques and their families, for once and—

**The Speaker:** The hon. parliamentary secretary.

*Oral Questions*

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the urgent action comes from actually building the kinds of vehicles, the kinds of batteries and the kinds of equipment that Canadians are increasingly investing in. That is why we have the gigafactory in southwestern Ontario and we have the NextStar plant, which is manufacturing, as we speak, batteries for the very vibrant economy in this sector. We look forward to the hon. member's coming on board with that.

\* \* \*

**FORESTRY INDUSTRY**

**Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was asked when he had last spoken with President Trump over the ongoing trade negotiations. He literally looked at the camera and said, “Who cares?” He said that it does not matter and that it is not a burning issue.

Let me tell the House who cares: the over 3,000 forestry workers in Cariboo—Prince George who are out of work and the communities that are being crushed by the softwood tariffs, communities where jobs are disappearing and mills are closing. Families are paying the price for the Prime Minister's failure, and he says, “Who cares?”

When will the Prime Minister start fighting for the workers he has abandoned?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have good news: We will be announcing additional supports for the forestry sector in the coming days. We have already announced \$1.2 billion in supports for the industry. We are working hard. We are talking with industry members every day. I will be speaking with the leaders of the industry again tonight. We will have a new set of supports by the end of the week.

**Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister mentions more and more supports. People do not want charity; they want their jobs. The Prime Minister clearly said he does not care and that it does not matter. Is he kidding me? Over 30 mills have closed in the province of British Columbia, including 14 in my riding.

Does the Prime Minister know who cares and who matters? Little Lucas does. He is 10 years old and is a student at 100 Mile Elementary school. He could not hold back tears when he was talking about his family members who lost their jobs.

Why does the Prime Minister not fly to my riding, look Lucas's family members in the eye and tell them they do not matter?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, like Lucas, I lived in a forestry town. I know what it feels like. I know how important the workers are. That is why we have announced \$1.2 billion in support, that is why we are meeting with the leaders of the industry today and that is why we will be announcing another set of supports for the industry later this week.

We have a trade war. The member should wake up.

**Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister once said that he was a master negotiator who

could secure a deal with President Trump by July. He failed, and now he shrugs it off, saying, “Who cares?” and that he does not have a burning issue to speak with the President about.

I can help the Prime Minister. New Brunswickers care, because 93% of our exports go to the U.S. The longer this issue goes unresolved, the more uncertainty there is for New Brunswick's forestry workers. Say “Who cares?” to the people who live in Florenceville-Bristol, in Plaster Rock or in Nackawic. They certainly do care, and they want a government that responds.

When will the Prime Minister secure a resolution and meet with our closest neighbour and customer?

● (1440)

**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, it might be useful to remind our colleague from New Brunswick that the government had been engaged in constructive and extensive negotiations with the American administration and that we were pursuing a deal we believed would be in the interests of Canadian workers and the Canadian economy, and the Americans as well.

President Trump decided to suspend those negotiations, and while he did that, is my colleague suggesting that the government do nothing to support the very workers he talked about? There is good news: We are not going to do that. We are going to support those workers and stand up for those industries.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ETHICS**

**Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Brookfield company assets still owned by the Prime Minister, which he placed into a blind trust. The Ethics Commissioner set up a conflict of interest screen for the Prime Minister. This screen is administered by two of his advisors, including Michael Sabia.

However, Mr. Sabia also owned shares in Brookfield. He sold them to protect his Prime Minister. If Mr. Sabia sold his shares to protect the Prime Minister from any appearance of conflict of interest, why will the Prime Minister not do the same?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member is well aware, parliamentarians, and even senior public servants, are subject to one of the strictest codes of ethics in the world. Like the rest of us, the Prime Minister has always followed all the rules and, incidentally, will continue to do so.

*Oral Questions*

**Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the highest office in government must be transparent and beyond reproach. Doubt will remain as long as the Prime Minister is both a shareholder and decision-maker. For example, in October 2024, the Prime Minister helped to relocate Brookfield's head office from Toronto to New York. Seven months later, at the G7, he announced that U.S.-based companies would no longer have to pay the global minimum tax of 15% aimed at countering tax evasion.

How much money did the Prime Minister save Brookfield and how much did he cost the public purse?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister follows one of the strictest codes of ethics in the world. He is not doing anything for Brookfield.

\* \* \*

**STEEL AND ALUMINUM INDUSTRY**

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign, the Prime Minister boasted about being a great negotiator and said he would settle the tariffs by July 21. Today is November 24. Negotiations have stalled. Worse still, when asked if there had been any new discussions, he replied that he did not care and that there was no urgency. The aluminum workers, however, do care.

Will the Prime Minister be able to look them in the eyes and tell them that their jobs are not important?

**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, again, our colleague knows full well that the government is very interested in taking every measure step to protect the aluminum industry, the workers in that industry and the other industries that were just mentioned. He knows full well that President Trump is the one who decided to suspend the negotiations that, to us and to the American side, were on track to bringing Canada and the United States to an agreement that would have been in the best interests of these workers.

As long as the Americans do not want to negotiate, we will be there to protect the industries affected.

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, since this Prime Minister took office, not only are aluminum tariffs still in place, but they have doubled. He seems to forget that Quebec produces 90% of all Canadian aluminum. In my region of Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, that means 30,000 direct and indirect jobs. Those workers need that income to pay for housing and food.

How can the Prime Minister not care?

• (1445)

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, we are maintaining countertariffs on steel and aluminum. We have the \$5-billion strategic response fund. We also have the buy Canadian procurement policy, through which we are supporting our businesses by requiring the use of Canadian steel and aluminum in domestic projects across the country.

We hope the opposition will support us on these issues. We are counting on it.

[English]

**Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister was asked this weekend whether he had spoken to Trump about trade, his response was, "Who cares?" He said it was not a "burning issue".

Well, I can tell members who cares. Conservatives care, and so do the thousands of Hamilton steelworkers and manufacturing workers who go to bed every night wondering if they will have a job in the morning. How can the Prime Minister look Hamilton steelworkers in the eye and tell them their job security is not a burning issue?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the steelworkers would be pretty disappointed if they knew that this Conservative member of Parliament keeps fighting against the very measures the government is putting in place to save our steel sector.

I was at Algoma Steel just a few months ago, working with that company and its workers to make sure the company has liquidity so that it can find new markets, protect those jobs and ensure its workers are trained and attached to the workforce. These are concepts that the Conservatives cannot even understand, because they keep voting against the very people who sent them here.

**Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is a 30-second admission of guilt and failure by the current government. A response of "Who cares?" is a terrible attempt to downplay how important a trade deal is for Canadian steel and manufacturing. The steelworkers of Hamilton want an answer.

They want a deal, a deal that would give them job security, pay their bills and feed their families; this deal was promised to them on July 21. On behalf of the Canadian steel and manufacturing workers, when will the Prime Minister deliver on his promise and get a deal done?

**Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker I met with workers from Ingersoll and forestry workers in B.C., and I have met with steelworkers in that member's riding. Our message is consistent: We will be there for workers, and we will be there for their families.

Why did the member vote against the budget? The budget would provide supports for all these industries, but the Conservatives like to come in here and perform for the camera while we are doing the work. We are going to defend our country.

*Oral Questions*

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals think Canadians should be satisfied with begging for scraps from their table. The Prime Minister said he would be a master negotiator. He said he would get a deal with Trump done by July 21. He failed. Now he says, “Who cares?” and that there is no “burning issue”.

Well, Conservatives care, and so do the members of USW 5890. They are the hard-working men at Interpro Pipe and Steel in Regina, and they care about their jobs. How can the Prime Minister look them in the eye and say the jobs that feed their family are not a burning issue?

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are going to defend our workers by having a \$5-billion strategic response fund. That party voted against this. We are going to defend our workers by having a buy Canadian policy, the most ambitious buy Canadian policy on record. That party opposed this. We are always going to be there for our workers. Is that party going to be on their side?

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians support our efforts to diversify Canadian trade. That is why our government is on a mission to double non-U.S. exports over the next decade and to unleash \$1 trillion in new investments in Canada. Every door the Prime Minister opens means more opportunities for the businesses in my riding to reach new markets, grow their business and create jobs in Sudbury.

Can the Minister of International Trade update Canadians on the landmark investments delivered by the Prime Minister and say why leadership on the world stage matters?

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Sudbury for her tireless work. While the Canada-U.A.E. investment agreement began in 2014, this government finished it in just months, leading to our Prime Minister's securing the single largest investment commitment of \$70 billion.

We are now elevating our relationship by negotiating a trade deal to cut tariffs, remove red tape and boost Canadian exports to the U.A.E. We are building new international relationships to grow trade and attract investments to build the fastest-growing economy in the G7.

\* \* \*

● (1450)

**THE ECONOMY**

**Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, driving up the cost of everything. Food inflation on baby formula is up 84% in eight years. Formula is one of the top stolen food products in Canada, and it is now kept under lock and key in many places in Canada.

I heard from Cyara, a Manitoba mom, who knew she was buying stolen baby formula but did it anyway because she had no other

choice. Does the Prime Minister care that parents cannot afford to buy baby formula?

**Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we have taken and are taking action to fight food insecurity. This is why, among other measures, we are making the national school food program permanent to ensure more children have access to healthy meals at school. This also represents over \$800 in savings on families' grocery bills. We introduced a middle-class tax cut. We introduced dental care. We have early learning and child care arrangements with provinces across the country, bringing costs down by thousands of dollars. We are there for families.

I would encourage the members opposite to support these measures as well.

**Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, babies do not go to school.

The Liberals do not even listen. This is about baby formula, not school food.

The Liberal programs are not working, and they are making it worse. Families are switching to cow milk and solids earlier than doctors recommend because they have no other choice. They cannot afford baby formula, and they do not want their children to starve under the Liberal policies.

Does the Prime Minister care that families are making tough choices because the Liberals refuse to act?

**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, this government is investing in infants and children of all ages. Not only did we create the Canada child benefit, but families received it last week. We also committed to \$10-a-day child care spaces across the country. Parents in my riding are saving over \$10,000 a year for their kids. However, members should not take my word for it.

Let me tell the House about what a parent said at Andrew Fleck Children's Services: “We've been able to have healthier meals at home and start saving for post-secondary education with early learning and child care. Without this extra funding, it would have been impossible to survive and live in our current house”.

*Oral Questions*

This is the difference—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Cambridge.

\* \* \*

**CARBON PRICING**

**Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the costliest in Canadian history, and hard-working families are paying the price. In my community, people tell me they are working hard and saving up, but they are still walking out of the grocery store with half a cart for twice the price. Demand at the Cambridge Food Bank is up 114%, and 1,000 new families are turning to it for the first time. The culprit is simple. It is the Liberal industrial carbon tax on farmers and fertilizer that gets baked into every loaf of bread and every slice of meat on the shelves.

Why is the Prime Minister insisting on not only keeping the industrial carbon tax but also raising it when Canadians already cannot afford to feed their kids?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are back to the imaginary taxes again. There is no tax on food. Farms are largely, if not totally, exempt from the industrial carbon tax. Even their favourite Twitter guy, the food professor, says there is no incidence on food prices from the matters the member mentions.

I would invite her to correct herself.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the best program is a well-paying job with low inflation, yet after 10 years of Liberal government, Canadians have neither. The same government that created this mess now wants applause for pretending to fix it, but more government and more taxes only mean more inflation for Canadians. Food prices have climbed nearly 40% faster here than in the U.S. and faster than wages can keep up. Four out of five Canadians say food is their biggest budget stress, and 30% are now forced to choose between heating their homes and feeding their families. The Prime Minister refuses to listen and keeps hiking inflationary taxes that send people to the food bank.

Why is the Prime Minister forcing Canadians to choose between going cold and going hungry?

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps a better question is why the Conservatives keep on pointing to imaginary taxes as they go forward.

Let us be clear: There is no food packaging tax. I have said it before, but I will say it again: There is no food packaging tax. Beyond that, the industrial carbon price does not add to the cost of food. Study after study has been done and proves that point.

If the Conservatives want to support Canadians, I hope they will support the programs we put forth, and I hope they will fight climate change, because that is actually one of the major causes of the increased cost of food.

• (1455)

**Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Prime Minister spends is either taxed from the pockets of Canadians or comes from printed and borrowed money, driving up inflation and the cost of everything in Canada. In P.E.I., university food bank usage is up 60%. It is the same old story right across Atlantic Canada, yet the Prime Minister is refusing to scrap his costly regulations, which only make it more expensive to fish, farm and ship our food.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax, increasing the fuel tax and making it even more expensive for Canadians?

**Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was in my riding last weekend, and I spent time at a school in the riding. I served food—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Fisheries can start from the top.

**Hon. Joanne Thompson:** Mr. Speaker, I was in my riding last weekend. I served food in a school. In my riding, the educators and the administrators all spoke about how important that program is to the 400 children in that school. I also want to remind the member opposite that I had many meetings in the riding with constituents, with Progressive Conservative business owners. They are thanking me for the budget that is investing in this country, that is building this country. We have solutions.

I will not play this political rhetoric game.

\* \* \*

**FINANCE**

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly credit card budget piles his inflationary spending and debt on to our children and our grandchildren. Canadians are putting nearly 50% more on credit cards for basic living expenses than they were just 10 years ago. Now, Fitch Ratings warns that the government has blown past its own fiscal anchors and says “finances run a high risk of further deterioration”.

How many more red warning lights need to start flashing before the Prime Minister stops treating taxpayers like a limitless credit card?

*Oral Questions*

**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, the only word the opposition seems to know is “no”. It is time for them to take yes for an answer. We said yes to investing in our businesses and entrepreneurs. They said no. We said yes to a national food program. They said no. We said yes to affordable homes and investing in our military. They said no.

It is time for them to say yes to Canada and build this country strong.

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Fitch Ratings is sounding the warning. Yes, Canadians are drowning in credit card bills after a decade of Liberal inflation, and, yes, the Parliamentary Budget Officer says the Liberals have abandoned their own debt-to-GDP anchor, the very same anchor they said protects their AAA rating. The PBO further concluded that the Liberals have almost no chance of achieving their declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. It is no wonder the costly Prime Minister wants to fire the PBO.

How many more fiscal watchdog reports have to come out for the Prime Minister to rein in his inflationary spending?

**Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are not buying what the Conservative leader and his party are selling. In fact, 70% of Canadians have no confidence in him to lead. Last week, we passed a historic budget by Canadians and for Canadians, so we will never be reliant on one country again.

It is time for that member to put down the talking points and get on board with us; let us build Canada.

**Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this credit card budget loads today's spending on to tomorrow's taxpayers. Fitch credit ratings, which rates the government's credit, says the Liberal government frequently blows through its fiscal anchors and has “a high risk of further deterioration”. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says the government abandoned its previous fiscal anchor, which was there to preserve its AAA rating.

How many more disastrous independent reports is it going to take for the Prime Minister to rein in his spending?

**Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from these guys, but Kevin Page, a former parliamentary budget officer, will give them some lessons. He said:

We need to focus on economic growth. We need capital investment to boost innovation, improve our infrastructure and diversify trade. We live in dangerous times, and we must meet our NATO spending targets.

I believe Parliament should approve the budget plan....

On this side of the House, we will fight for Canadians because every day is a good day to fight for Canadians.

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

**Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the \$78-billion deficit budget is dangerous. The Liberals have maxed out Canada's credit card. We are being warned by experts, including Fitch Ratings, which gives government credit ratings.

They are saying to be careful because there is a high risk of making Canada's financial crisis worse. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer, an impartial officer of the House of Commons, says that this government is putting Canada's AAA rating at risk.

Who can make the Prime Minister listen to reason so that he will change his ways and stop spending so recklessly?

**Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have the best fiscal position of all the G7 countries, the best debt-to-GDP and deficit-to-GDP ratios in the G7 and a AAA credit rating.

There is a reason why the International Monetary Fund is praising Canada's approach. There is a reason why the economists in the House are on this side of the chamber. There is also a reason why I am sure that, deep down inside, my colleague from Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier was pleased to see his colleagues hiding behind the curtains to make sure that budget 2025 was passed. It is because this is a good budget.

\* \* \*

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Steve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government has passed an ambitious budget that includes transformative investments in our transportation system. The Minister of Transport visited both the port and the airport in Quebec City to discuss these initiatives. Prior to that, he visited the Magdalen Islands.

Could the minister provide more details on the important announcement he made and what it means for the community?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have had a great time touring around and promoting all of the good transportation news coming out of this budget for Quebec. In fact, after receiving numerous requests from the Bloc Québécois, including one to extend the runway on the Magdalen Islands, I was very pleased to go there and share the good news.

I would like to thank the people of the Magdalen Islands for their warm welcome.

What happened next? We got back to Ottawa and the Bloc Québécois voted against this project, against the Port of Saguenay and the other proposals, including the one involving Contrecoeur. Unfortunately, the Bloc Québécois—

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Thornhill.

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after Justin Trudeau killed a pipeline in 2016 and backed the west coast shipping ban, the Liberals want credit for reversing their own damage. Reality has finally caught up and Canadians do not know which Prime Minister they might get. One day he is a climate crusader who wrote himself into green stardom, and now he is scrambling to review the very projects he spent a decade sabotaging.

Will the government admit that its “keep it in the ground” crusade strangled our economy, weakened our sovereignty and left workers with the bill, or will it keep pretending that this was not all self-inflicted as it dances around a pipeline announcement?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the member opposite is nostalgic for the previous government, but that is not who is working right now.

Canada will be a leading global energy superpower in both clean and conventional energy. We did not ask for this trade war, but we will win it. We got elected to build strong nation-building projects. We got elected to grow our economy. We got elected to reinforce Canadian autonomy and independence. We will do that in conjunction with indigenous peoples and environmentally responsibly.

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Alberta is expecting an east-west pipeline. The media is also reporting on the announcement of an east-west pipeline. The only ones who have not said it are the ones who are directly responsible for it. The Liberals cannot even utter the word “pipeline”.

I have a simple question. Is the government in favour of an east-west pipeline, yes or no?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government will look at any project, including a pipeline brought forward by a proponent. We have a process under Bill C-5 to look at it.

When a pipeline comes forward, if the Government of Alberta wants to bring it forward, we will look at it then.

\*\*\*

• (1505)

## ETHICS

**Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, no matter how hard the days get for average Canadians, like the 2.2 million Canadians who go to a food bank every day, it is always a good day for Brookfield. The latest good news for Brookfield is a \$500-million contract with the European Space Agency, which is housed in a property that is 50% owned by Brookfield.

Why is it the priority of the government to line the pockets of the Prime Minister's former company with a \$500-million contract when there are 2.2 million Canadians lining up at food banks because they cannot afford to feed themselves and when there is a 6.9% unemployment rate?

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on a day when we have Jeremy Hansen, the Canadian astronaut, here with us, I would like to quote from another astronaut, Marc Garneau: “The best way for Canada

## Oral Questions

was to work with other countries, as we had with NASA since the 1960s. That is why Canada signed an agreement with the European Space Agency in the 1970s, as well as several bilateral agreements with other countries, allowing us to fly Canadian hardware on their spacecraft in return for sharing the scientific results. Maintaining those relationships will continue to be important.”

This is what we do when we build Canada strong.

\*\*\*

[Translation]

## THE ECONOMY

**Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of Canada's greatest strengths is our ability to take decisive action and seize opportunities around the world. That is important for businesses in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles and for businesses across Canada that want to grow and expand. Our government is working hard to gain entry to new markets and secure major contracts and investments.

Could the Minister of Finance tell Canadians about the concrete investments that have come about under the Prime Minister's leadership?

**Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it feels good to get such a great question.

Although words fail the opposition when it comes to celebrating our economy, our Prime Minister has announced a \$70-billion investment in Canada's economy made possible by the quality, experience and know-how of our workers.

On this side of the House, we will always work to build a strong Canada and a strong economy because we understand what Canada has to offer.

Let us celebrate Canada together.

\*\*\*

## EMPLOYMENT

**Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a friend is a friend for this Prime Minister, who is very proud of his European roots and his Brookfield pedigree.

While a quarter of Canadians have to go into debt to pay for groceries, the Prime Minister is giving \$500 million to the European Space Agency to create jobs in Europe at the Harwell Science and Innovation Campus. Can anyone guess who owns 50% of that campus? Let me end the suspense. It is Brookfield.

*Routine Proceedings*

Is this another coincidence or another scheme to line the pockets of the Prime Minister's friends?

How can the Prime Minister let 600,000 Quebecers line up at food banks while sending their money and their jobs to Europe?

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this year is Canada's year for space, and the question from the member opposite surprises me, especially since we have an astronaut here with us today.

The investments we are making in Europe will help grow the Canadian economy. Every dollar invested in the European Space Agency generates more than three dollars in sales.

A briefing will be held on December 11, and I encourage the member to attend so that businesses in his riding can benefit from this.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians want to diversify trade, but we want to diversify trade with democracies that share our values and that respect human rights.

Now we are cozying up to the People's Republic of China. I have not heard that it is starting to treat the Uyghurs well. I do not understand how we can want to do deals with countries like Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, which right now have been caught with personnel carriers carrying out war crimes in Sudan.

Do we trade away our values and our souls when we trade with those countries?

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, respect for human rights, labour and the environment remains at the heart of our trade policies and our high-standard trade agreements.

Canada is deliberate and mindful when negotiating trade agreements, and we prioritize Canadian values. Building new trading partners around the world is an important driver to promote Canadian values, create jobs and encourage economic growth that works for everyone.

\* \* \*

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the 2025 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Impact Award winners.

[*English*]

They are Joshua Steckley, Jason Edward Lewis, Kamari Maxine Clarke, Tara McGee, Chief David Diabo and Myriam Denov.

I would also like to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of a Canadian crew member from NASA's Artemis II mission to the moon: Mission Specialist Jeremy Hansen.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** I invite all hon. members to join Mr. Hansen and me in the Speaker's salon, room 233-S, immediately following question period for a reception in his honour.

**Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding Bill C-15, the budget 2025 implementation act, no. 1.

I would like to notify the House of a technical issue in clause 71. That clause of Bill C-15 proposes amendments to the trust reporting rules in the Income Tax Act. Some of these amendments were intended to first apply to the 2024 taxation year. Due to a technical issue in subclause 71(14) of Bill C-15, these amendments are inadvertently limited so that they apply only to the 2024 taxation year and not later years.

It is the government's intention that the proposed amendments referenced in that subclause apply to the 2024 taxation year as well as to subsequent taxation years. This is consistent with what was reflected in the draft legislative proposals for this measure, which were publicly released by the Department of Finance in August 2025.

To provide clarity to impacted taxpayers, the government intends to propose an amendment to Bill C-15 to rectify this technical issue at the first opportunity.

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[*English*]

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

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

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

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and in accordance with the enhanced transparency requirements related to new free trade agreements introduced in the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament in 2020, I am pleased to notify the House of Commons of the Government's intent to initiate negotiations for a Canada-India comprehensive economic partnership agreement. The Government of Canada intends to commence negotiations with India no earlier than 90 days from the date of this notice.

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

• (1515)

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

That notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, at the conclusion of Oral Questions on Wednesday, November 26, 2025, a member of each of the recognized parties, a member of the New Democratic Party, the member of the Green Party, and the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel—Alnôbak each be permitted to make a statement for no more than five minutes; and that the time taken for these proceedings shall be added to the time provided for Government Orders

**The Speaker:** All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

#### PETITIONS

##### MALNUTRITION

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to present a petition from a group of citizens from Madawaska—Restigouche regarding malnutrition.

They are calling on the government to convene a Canada-wide summit on malnutrition to begin discussing a framework for action on malnutrition care in Canada, expand Canada's healthy eating strategy and mandate the collection and reporting of malnutrition data by the Canadian Institute for Health Information and Statistics Canada.

[*English*]

##### CLIMATE CHANGE

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to present a petition from petitioners concerned with the impact on the climate crisis of energy use in Canadian

#### Routine Proceedings

homes. Of all energy consumed in Canada, 17% is used for heating, cooling, lighting and powering our homes, which is warming the outdoors in the winter and cooling the outdoors in the summer because of the basic lack of energy efficiency infrastructure and the lack of work to create cheaper energy-efficient homes.

The petitioners call on the government to work with the provinces and territories to develop new national building codes to reduce the overall energy demand to 15% of what current structures use and to contribute to affordability for Canadians.

#### BRAIN INJURY

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour today to rise to table a petition on behalf of petitioners from Parksville, Qualicum Beach, Courtenay, Cumberland and Port Alberni in my riding. They are calling for urgent federal leadership regarding brain injury awareness, prevention and treatment.

The petitioners note that brain injuries can occur in many ways, from accidents to illnesses and strokes, and that they often result in serious physical, cognitive, emotional and behavioural effects. Petitioners further point out that brain injuries are frequently linked with other challenges, including substance use and homelessness, creating additional barriers for people affected. It is estimated that 1.6 million Canadians are living with a brain injury today, yet there is no coordinated national response.

The petitioners therefore call upon the Government of Canada to develop a national strategy on brain injuries to improve awareness and prevention, as well as to ensure better access for treatment, rehabilitation and recovery support for Canadians living with the impacts of brain injury.

It is an honour to table this petition. It is timely, as brain injury advocates are in Ottawa right now to call on the government to take action.

#### NATIONAL BUILDING CODE

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.):** Barbara Robinson is a professional engineer in the riding of Waterloo. She and dozens of other petitioners have signed a petition calling on the Government of Canada to update, to change, the National Building Code.

The petitioners acknowledge that the National Building Code, part 3, makes no provision for menstruating women's needs in public toilet stalls. They raise the point that unless something is poo or pee, it should not go down the toilet, so pads and tampons should really have a space for disposal; therefore, adding to the code the necessity of having a garbage can in women's stalls is important.

### Government Orders

Citizens and residents of the riding and region of Waterloo are calling upon the Government of Canada to change the National Building Code to make provisions for public toilet stalls to meet the needs of people who menstruate.

\* \* \*

• (1520)

#### QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445 and 446 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

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

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

##### GENOCIDE OF CHRISTIANS IN NIGERIA

**The Speaker:** I wish to inform the House that I have received notice of a request for an emergency debate. I invite the hon. Leader of the Opposition to rise and make a brief intervention.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to seek an emergency debate on the genocide being carried out against Nigerian Christians.

One of the worst mass kidnappings ever reported in Nigeria occurred on Friday, in which more than 300 schoolchildren were abducted from St. Mary's Private Catholic Secondary School after an attack by armed men.

Since Boko Haram launched its insurgency in 2009, the impact on Christian communities has been devastating. Millions of people have been driven from their homes, hundreds have lost their lives in targeted violence, entire villages have been wiped out, families have been torn apart, children have been forced to abandon their faith, and communities have been left in ruin.

Terrorist groups like Boko Haram, Fulani militias and ISWAP continue to carry out these brutal attacks with alarming precision. These are not mere political disputes or regional unrest; they are examples of calculated violence against innocent people because of their Christian faith. It represents a grave violation of human rights and basic individual dignity.

Our belief in the inherent worth of every person means we must take action. Canada must stand with the people who suffer, speak out against these atrocities and press the international community to

act. Freedom of worship, freedom of conscience and freedom of association are non-negotiable; these are core Canadian and universal values.

Millions of people face persecution around the world, and no group more than Christians. Mr. Speaker, we ask that you recognize this genocide, stand with us today, and allow an emergency debate so that we may be the voice of the voiceless.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his intervention. However, I am not satisfied that the request meets the requirements of the Standing Orders at this time. That being said, I know that this is a topic of great interest to many members. I want to assure the House that I am open to reconsidering the request at a later date if the situation warrants.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The leader of the Conservative Party, last week, requested an emergency debate and later on went on to say that it was the government that opposed the debate. I think it is important that we emphasize that the government does not oppose emergency debates. It is a ruling from the Chair. The official opposition should be aware of that and not promote something that is other than truth.

**Hon. Andrew Scheer:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I just point out that there are many instances where we have asked the government to grant take-note debates on an emergency basis for very important topics, and it is the government that says no to those. Only the government can grant an emergency take-note debate, and that is something the government has repeatedly denied.

**The Speaker:** In any event, it is true that when it comes to requests for emergency debates, it is a ruling of the Speaker. If the Chair rules against an emergency debate, it does not mean that the subject matter is not important, only that the specific criteria for granting one have not been met.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[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 Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

**The Speaker:** At the beginning of question period, we were at the end of the speech by the hon. member for Compton—Stanstead. There are five minutes remaining for questions and comments.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I represent Madawaska—Restigouche, a rural riding. I am also a member of our rural caucus, and I can attest to the fact that our colleague, who is the chair of that caucus, is a strong advocate for regional interests.

*Government Orders*

I would like to ask her what our budget says about temporary foreign workers. This is an important issue for our caucus.

• (1525)

**Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche for being so actively involved in our caucus and for presenting so many good ideas to help take the regions of Quebec, New Brunswick and all of Canada to the next level.

He asked an excellent question about temporary foreign workers, who have a major impact on rural areas. People are concerned that some of these workers might go, leaving a lot of companies that rely on their labour in the lurch. Through budget 2025, we gave some temporary residents permanent residency, which will reduce the pressure on Canada's temporary immigration system. That is important because this pressure has become far too great.

We are getting temporary immigration back under control. We are granting permanent residency. As I was saying, this will take some of the pressure off and keep workers in the regions. The budget also mentions how important immigration is to rural and remote areas and to industries affected by tariffs.

[*English*]

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are looking for paycheques that last to the end of the month. They are struggling. Home ownership is increasingly out of reach. Making their rent is a challenge for millions of Canadians. Purchasing groceries is a weekly burden.

Why are the Liberals so oblivious to the fact that their irresponsible deficit and debt accumulation is fuelling inflation?

[*Translation*]

**Marianne Dandurand:** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague is talking about housing because affordable housing is one of the sectors where we are investing the most. I am very proud of that, because the initiatives we are rolling out will make it easy for the regions to access these measures.

Build Canada Homes will allow us to cut red tape and make the criteria broad enough so that regions like mine and small municipalities can build affordable housing. We are also making it easier to buy a home by eliminating the GST on new homes for first-time homebuyers.

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the member could provide their thoughts in regard to why it is so important that we continue to advocate and lobby for having trade that goes beyond the Canada-U.S. border. As a direct result of what is taking place between Canada and the U.S., there is an additional pressure for us to look outside the Canada-U.S. border.

[*Translation*]

**Marianne Dandurand:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question.

Trade between Canada and the U.S. is highly integrated. We are currently experiencing instability due to our relations with the U.S. Canadian businesses, including businesses in my region, are looking for new markets. The Government of Canada will award them contracts through its buy Canadian strategy, through the investments it will make in defence, and through the investments it will make in major projects.

However, it is also important to develop new markets, and that is why the Prime Minister is travelling the world right now. He wants to sign agreements so that businesses in the Eastern Townships, Quebec and Canada can find new customers in other parts of the world to replace their U.S. customers, since it is more difficult to do business with them right now.

[*English*]

**Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the chamber to fight for the great residents of Oxford County.

There was a promise in this country that if someone worked hard and played by the rules, they could achieve anything. People made sacrifices, but they knew those sacrifices would one day pay off. They knew that if they worked hard and sacrificed with time away from their families, they could retire in peace, build a beautiful life and pass something on to the next generation. Every generation would be better than the one previous.

However, what we have seen in the last 10 years from the Liberal government is fiscal carnage and fiscal irresponsibility. The last Liberal prime minister literally doubled the national debt. The new guy came in during the last election, just eight months ago, and he promised Canadians he would be different. He promised Canadians he was the man with a plan. He has banking experience, but we are looking at his banking results right now, and we see that he is cooking the books.

The budget that the Liberal government presented is going to spend a record amount of Canadian taxpayers' hard-earned money. The Liberals used slogans and said they were going to spend less and invest more, but they are actually spending record amounts, and Canadians are getting so much more of less for all the money they are spending. They said that the budget was going to be generational, but it is generational debt, which Canadians are going to struggle to pay.

The Liberals' budget is putting an extra cost of \$5,400 on every Canadian family. They cannot afford that. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, an independent officer whom the Liberals are now trying to fire, is also raising the alarm bells, saying that there are no fiscal anchors. The numbers on the Liberals' spreadsheet are just banker accounting to hide the real numbers in the deficit.

*Government Orders*

Oxford County is a strong community, but even there we are starting to see cracks in the foundation. There are lots of great charities that do amazing work. Just last week, Operation Sharing, which is one of the largest supports in Woodstock, put out a Facebook post showing the empty shelves at its food bank. The shelves are empty because demand has skyrocketed, not just from people who are on the streets but also from Canadians who are now considered the working poor. These are people who work extremely hard, including those who work double shifts, but who are struggling to get by because of the Liberals' fiscal irresponsibility.

There are stories from my riding I want to share with the House. The Liberals may say that this is all made up, but it is not. Their actions are having real consequences in the lives of Canadians. Nicole is a hard-working mother who works two jobs, 70 hours a week, and barely sees her autistic child. She has \$1,500 coming in every two weeks. Her rent costs \$2,500, and she is losing her home despite being in what is called the middle class. She said to me that she is now part of the working poor.

There is Shane, a trucker who has been on the road for 28 years. The tariffs, the trade wars, the industrial carbon tax and the cost of living crisis have all forced him to sell his personal belongings just to survive, not to live a luxurious lifestyle. Truckers sacrifice so much. They spend days on the road away from their family, moving our goods and making sure our supply chain is intact. They are sacrificing, yet they are barely moving up in life.

● (1530)

Denise, an auto worker from my riding, was just laid off permanently right before Christmas. She describes the plant closure as a gut punch.

A week and a half ago, we had Remembrance Day ceremonies in our ridings, and many members attended. I was at a Legion lunch after a ceremony, and one of the veterans, Connie, asked me if I could drop her off at her home, so she jumped in. As we were driving, she shared that her story is like that of many other seniors: She is struggling to pay rent, and for the first time, this month, she does not know how she will make up the difference. Our veterans are struggling as well.

Oxford County's industry and community are looking at truckers and suppliers who are losing their jobs because of plant closures and tariff impacts through Toyota, Vuteq and others. They are now all in jeopardy. These are real-life stories; they are not just numbers.

When we have two and a half million food bank visits in a single month, that does not show a strong, vibrant country. That does not show that the Liberals' plan is working. They often talk about the food program for kids. A sign of a healthy country and democracy is when parents, families and workers can feed their own children, save money and not rely on governments. For the Liberals, it is all about control and taking away power from our citizens.

This budget did absolutely nothing to help relieve the anxiety and tension that Canadians not only in my riding but across the country are facing. They looked at this budget and wanted something. Seniors wanted something, and youth wanted to know that

one day their sacrifice would pay off, but this budget has absolutely nothing to help them get by every single day.

This came from the guy who said he was the man with the plan. He promised this stuff. He made these big promises in the campaign, and now Canadians are learning they are having buyer's remorse. They know that those were just empty words to win over their trust.

It does not have to be this way. The Conservatives voted against this budget because we did not see any real relief for Canadians, but there is a better path forward where we unleash Canada's advantage and look to develop our natural resources. We can be one of the richest countries in the world if we get our energy moving to the rest of the world. We can cut taxes for hard-working Canadians and for businesses so they can innovate, take risks and help create jobs in our country. We can cut the red tape.

Under the Liberals' watch, red tape has skyrocketed, strangling any growth in our country. We have seen investment going down south and record numbers of folks moving out of the country because the Canadian promise that I spoke about earlier is no longer there.

There is a better path forward: a Conservative plan where we unleash Canada's natural resources, cut taxes and stand up for families. Every family could provide for themselves, and people's sacrifices would actually mean something. If they spent time away from their kids, they would know they could provide for their kids' sports games or soccer during the summer. It would be a country where it would not matter where people come from, what language they speak or what industry they work in, a united country that is successful.

I know that Canadians are some of the hardest-working people in the world, including our auto workers, farmers, machinists, servers and those in hospitality. When Canadians get down to business, everything is possible. The Liberals just have to get out of the way.

● (1535)

**Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this morning in the media, there was an article entitled "'Quiet buzz' on Bay Street about Carney's 'nation-building' major projects". It said, "There is a strong response within the finance community, within the engineering community, within the construction community. People are awake, people are aware". People are interested in knowing about the timelines on these projects as they seek to participate.

What are my colleague's views on major projects? Does he support fast-tracking major projects in Canada, as the people in my riding do? That is what I have heard people in my riding say.

• (1540)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Before I go on, I will just remind the parliamentary secretary not to use the names of members, including of the Prime Minister, in the House.

The hon. member for Oxford.

**Arpan Khanna:** Mr. Speaker, the only people benefiting from this Brookfield budget are Brookfield's management on Bay Street, so maybe what she is quoting is from Brookfield.

The folks who live on main street in our communities are struggling. Homelessness is at record numbers. Encampments are popping up everywhere. Food bank lineups are right around the corner, and people are barely struggling to get by.

I understand that the Liberals might be excited because the portfolio manager of the Prime Minister is probably lining pockets at Brookfield, but real Canadians are struggling. On this side of the House, we are going to stand up for working-class Canadians every step of the way.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to get my friend and colleague's thoughts on an important sector we share in this country: agriculture. In the budget, the government is sending over \$300 million to farmers in other parts of the world, yet our farmers are dealing with punishing tariffs here in Canada. Also, we have had many years of drought and of not being able to grow the crops the way we normally would like to.

I am wondering what the member thinks about the government's priorities when it comes to agriculture and what he is hearing from farmers in his riding.

**Arpan Khanna:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that I represent a great rural farming community. I want to thank the hon. member for all the great work he does in championing our farmers. As we all know, farmers are the ones who feed our families, and I can tell members that farmers are not happy with the government either.

We are asking for some sort of relief on tariffs, but every time the Prime Minister travels the world, things go the opposite way. Our farmers are now being hammered by Chinese canola tariffs. They are struggling to get our goods to market. We saw it with the Indians; they slapped new tariffs on our peas. The Prime Minister goes everywhere, and even though he is jet-setting around the world, there has been no relief for our farmers.

If we look at the budget, we see the same thing. Our farmers need our support. They want to grow. They want to keep feeding our families. We are going to keep supporting them every step of the way.

[*Translation*]

**Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there is something about this budget that keeps bugging me: I cannot find anything about investments in the justice system. Lord knows we need some, because the justice system has serious issues: Vacancies are not being filled, the backlog is overwhelming, and some courts

### *Government Orders*

cannot meet the deadlines set out in the Supreme Court's Jordan decision, meaning trials are being adjourned. It is a huge problem.

While dissecting the budget, did my colleague come across any mention of spending to improve the administration of the justice system in Canada?

[*English*]

**Arpan Khanna:** Mr. Speaker, that is a great question by hon. colleague. He and I share a passion for building a strong justice system.

I looked at the budget, and I do not think the word “crime” is mentioned even once. The Liberals keep reannouncing the promise that they are going to hire new officers, yet they have not done that. Even the public safety minister, who is responsible for this, says it is not his job.

We have a huge demand to support our law enforcement agencies and support our legal justice system. The member is absolutely correct to say that justice delayed is justice denied, and we are going to keep holding the government accountable for its failure to keep Canadians safe.

**Anthony Housefather (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today in support of budget 2025. We are building Canada strong. This is a plan that would protect our communities, empower Canadians with better careers and make life more affordable. We are creating an economy by Canadians for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Our government is cutting spending, building more and honouring our commitments, because that is how we are investing in Canada's future. Our government is focused on strengthening Canada's economic resilience. Today, however, I want to talk about a different kind of resilience, one that keeps our communities safe and ready to take on the challenges of a changing world.

[*English*]

As we all know, the nature of emergencies is changing. Extreme weather events are more frequent and more severe. Our government recognizes that our work does not stop once the flames are out or the flood waters recede. Emergency management continues long after any disaster occurs. It also begins long before any disaster happens, with smart planning and investments.

Emergency management and community resilience are a priority for this government. That is why budget 2025 contains several proposals that will further enhance our country's emergency preparedness and response.

*Government Orders*

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

The national public alerting system saves lives. It warns the public about natural disasters, which saves precious time and plays a key role. It also warns about child abductions through Amber alerts and helps keep children safe.

[*English*]

The budget proposes an investment of over \$55.4 million over four years, \$13.4 million a year on a continual basis, to renew the national public alerting system. This investment ensures that this critical tool remains active in keeping Canadians safe.

An updated alert system responds to recommendations from the Mass Casualty Commission, which examined the 2020 Nova Scotia mass shooting. It recommended transformative change to better prevent and respond to critical incidents and mass casualty events in the future, to help make Canadian communities safer. The renewal of the national public alerting system will ensure Canadians continue to receive amber alerts and warnings of imminent natural disasters, extreme weather events and security threats so they can take action to protect themselves and their communities.

[*Translation*]

The year is drawing to a close. The 2025 wildfire season has been the second-worst in Canadian history. One thing has become clear: The impacts of wildfires are growing and we need to be better prepared for them. Our government responded to 17 requests for assistance throughout this wildfire season. That is a significant number.

Although the active season is over, some regions are still fighting forest fires.

[*English*]

Here are some numbers. There were more than 6,000 wildfires in nearly every province and territory, impacting communities across the country and burning over 8.3 million hectares. Since April, the heightened risk and impacts have forced evacuations of more than 85,000 people, including over 45,000 people from 73 first nations communities.

These numbers represent the lived experience of thousands of people, including families forced to leave their home, communities rallying together and responders working tirelessly to protect lives and property. I want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the first responders, volunteers and local leaders who work tirelessly and demonstrate immense bravery to help keep Canadians safe.

While provinces and territories manage on-the-ground firefighting, the increasing scale and frequency of wildfires have made this a national issue that deserves a national response. To boost Canada's aerial firefighting capacity, budget 2025 will provide \$257.6 million to lease water bombers. This will make the federal government an even stronger partner in emergency response and builds on our other accomplishments to date.

One of our pivotal accomplishments has been the modernization of our financial assistance mechanisms. We recognize that recovery

costs from large-scale disasters are a substantial burden on provinces and territories, and that is why we revamped the disaster financial assistance arrangements.

[*Translation*]

In April, we launched a modernized program designed not only to accelerate and improve funding, but also to encourage proactive risk-reduction efforts across all levels of government to build back better.

[*English*]

Collaboration has been a cornerstone of our success. Through the humanitarian workforce program, we have funded and built capacity within non-governmental organizations like the Canadian Red Cross, which enables them to deploy resources quickly in response to large-scale emergencies. This civilian response capacity reduces the strain on the Canadian Armed Forces and allows for more tailored community-based responses.

I am particularly excited that budget 2025 creates a youth climate corps that will provide paid skills training for young Canadians. They will be trained to quickly respond to climate emergencies, support recovery and strengthen resilience in communities across the country. This initiative will support reducing youth unemployment, will increase innovation and will strengthen adaptation and mitigation projects.

With the investments we are making in budget 2025, we will be able to build further on these efforts to make a real difference in Canadians' lives. When a wildfire rages through a town, the cost is not just the price of the fire trucks and the water bombers. It is the cost of rebuilding homes and businesses that took generations to build. It is the psychological toll on families that lose their cherished memories and their sense of security. It is the billions in insured and uninsured damages that put immense strain on our economy and our social safety net.

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Every dollar we choose not to spend today on climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation and infrastructure resilience will result in exponential recovery costs tomorrow. This is not a matter of political ideology; it is a matter of financial responsibility and public safety.

[*English*]

The path ahead requires bold action and investment, yes, but let us be clear that it is an investment in the safety of our children to strengthen our economy and the enduring success of our country.

*Government Orders*

I know many of my hon. colleagues across the House, from all parties, have discussed the impact of climate change in their communities. In fact, they have called on the government to step up capacity and play a larger role in emergency management. With this budget, that is exactly what we are doing. Budget 2025 is our plan to take control and build the future we want for ourselves, as a people and as a country. It is our plan to build Canada strong.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member has talked a lot about climate change, its effects and the impact it has, but there are a couple of things that the budget does not talk about and does not deal with, and I was hoping the member would have addressed it in his speech.

There have been 30 sawmill closures in the province of B.C. There have been multiple sawmill closures in Quebec. We have seen a decimation of the forestry industry, yet there is no recognition by the government of those mills and those workers. Without them, the rebuild strategy is basically non-existent. If we look at what happened in Jasper and the town burning down, the department knew that there was a disaster about to happen, yet it did nothing about it. It did nothing to actively manage the forest to make sure there were protections, yet there is nothing in the budget addressing that.

How does the member opposite square that with his speech around the effects of climate change when the government knows there are steps it can take and it refuses to do it?

**Anthony Housefather:** Mr. Speaker, the budget talks about jobs for all Canadians. We care about people who work in sawmills, and we care about people who work in every industry. That is why this budget builds jobs and gives money to those industries that need it the most and are impacted by the U.S. tariffs.

The budget also deals with climate change, and we deal with emergency management. I do not agree with the way the member expressed what happened in Jasper. That is not what any of the reports related to Jasper said, but we do know that we need to be a good partner with provinces and territories to make sure we are resilient when it comes to the natural disasters that come from climate change, and that is what we are doing.

[*Translation*]

**Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague is an MP from Quebec. He knows the extent of the crisis in Quebec's health care system. He is also very aware of the fragility of that system. Unfortunately, there is no new money in this budget. Worse still, the health transfer escalator will drop from 6% to 3%, which will once again weaken the provinces and Quebec.

Does my colleague agree with me that this should not happen?

**Anthony Housefather:** Mr. Speaker, I completely agree that the health care system in Quebec, and in several other provinces, is very fragile. Federal government investments are very important.

However, the questions I am hearing from the doctors in my community concern Quebec's Bill 2 and the problems it will cause, including the closure of family medicine clinics in almost every region of Quebec. In my riding, 20 clinics have sent me letters saying that they may have to close their doors because of the changes re-

sulting from Bill 2. I therefore hope that the Quebec government will amend Bill 2 to ensure the survival of Quebec's health care system.

[*English*]

**Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague how the businesses in his community have reacted to some of the many tax incentives that were included in our budget. I know, in my riding, businesses reacted very positively to the productivity superdeduction.

I would like the member's thoughts on how his business community is reacting.

• (1555)

**Anthony Housefather:** Mr. Speaker, my businesses have also reacted very well to the tax credits and the tax breaks that are being given in the budget. I believe my population has also reacted well to the general tax cut that was given to all Canadians in the very first law the House passed in the spring.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of buying water bombers is long overdue. While the budget commits \$381 million over four years, that would only lease four water bombers. The water bombers are oversubscribed and are all being ordered by the European Union.

When will Canada buy our own water bomber fleet?

**Anthony Housefather:** Mr. Speaker, I share the hon. member's concern about wildfires that are caused by climate change.

This is a first step. It is a good first step. I want to continue to work with her and other members to continue to support the provinces in their fight against wildfires.

**Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House to speak on behalf of the good people of Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner. Today it is to discuss budget 2025.

This fall, before the budget was tabled, my office sent out a survey across my riding to hear directly from constituents about their priorities and expectations for the 2025 budget. An overwhelming 76% of respondents listed the cost of living as their top concern, and nearly 80% of business owners said rising costs are hurting their operations. Of the respondents, 85% said that they are concerned about their financial future, and 88% said they do not believe that Canada's economic situation will improve in the near future.

### *Government Orders*

Conservatives have heard these concerns echoed by families, individuals and businesses across the country, which is why, before the budget was tabled, we presented the Prime Minister with a common-sense plan that laid out our expectations for an affordable budget. In our pre-budget meetings, Conservatives demanded the Liberals include measures in their budget to address the cost of living crisis by scrapping hidden taxes on groceries and gas, cutting taxes on work and homebuilding, and ending the reckless deficits that fuel inflation.

Sadly, the November 4 budget missed that mark. It would fail to provide any meaningful relief for Canadians struggling to make ends meet. Budget 2025 would add nearly \$80 billion to our national debt this year alone, the highest amount in Canadian history outside of COVID, all the while keeping Liberal taxes on groceries, work, energy and homebuilding. This budget would add \$10 million to our debt every hour, and the Liberals intend to add another \$321 billion to Canada's debt over the next five years.

What many Canadians may not know is that, as a direct result of the Liberal reckless spending, our national debt is now at \$1.35 trillion. This means that every Canadian, infant to senior, owes \$33,000 as their share of Canada's federal debt, and as our debt rises, so too does the interest burden on that debt. Budget 2025 revealed that \$55.6 billion will be required to debt service or interest charges this fiscal year alone. What this unbelievable amount really means is that the federal government is spending more on annual debt interest costs than it is on federal health transfers to the provinces or than is collected in GST revenues.

This level of spending is not just reckless; it is dangerous and puts the future of our nation at risk. It is not just Conservatives who are concerned about this reckless spending. Experts from across the country have spoken out against this record-breaking Liberal deficit. Fitch Ratings, one of Canada's top credit rating agencies, warned that rising fiscal spending and debt burden have weakened the country's credit profile, putting Canada's AAA credit rating at risk.

Even more shocking was the report released by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, Parliament's neutral, non-partisan official responsible for providing economic and fiscal analysis to parliamentarians and Canadians. The report found that Canada's traditional fiscal anchor, the debt-to-GDP ratio, "is no longer projected to be on a declining path". This long-standing fiscal anchor is important not only for fiscal sustainability but also for preserving Canada's AAA credit rating.

This fall, to avoid accountability, the Liberals quietly replaced Canada's long-standing debt-to-GDP fiscal anchor with a new one, maintaining not a declining debt-to-GDP, but rather a deficit-to-GDP, ratio. This one-word change effectively dismantled the fiscal anchor that has existed for more than 30 years in a process that was certainly far from transparent.

Despite changing the goalposts, the PBO's report found that "it is unlikely that the Government's declining deficit-to-GDP fiscal anchor will be respected." It is disappointing, though not surprising, that the Liberals have resorted to accounting tricks to create confusion instead of working to get their deficit under control and stop their reckless spending.

On top of these shifting targets, the Liberals are trying to distract from their record-breaking deficit by differentiating between operating and capital spending, despite the bottom line of Canada's debt remaining unchanged. Their fiscal anchor of balancing the operating budget by 2028 gives the illusion of fiscal stability while allowing the government to rack up huge deficit spending on the capital side of the books.

• (1600)

In his report, the PBO found the Liberals' definition of capital investment to be "overly expansive", going way beyond the internationally accepted definition adopted in other countries. Using a more accepted definition, the PBO found \$94 billion in spending misclassified as capital and said, "based on our definition, the operating balance in Budget 2025 would remain in a deficit position". This report by the impartial budget watchdog lays out a clear fiscal outlook for Canadians. Not a single fiscal anchor is likely to be met, and these dangerous deficits will continue to drive up the cost of essentials and make life even more unaffordable.

In light of this analysis, the Liberals are now trying to get rid of this PBO, looking for a new officer who has "tact and discretion". The Liberals have only themselves to blame for Canada's fiscal outlook, their poor fiscal outlook, yet instead of bringing down the deficit, they are attempting to silence those who hold them accountable. While typical of the government's record of avoiding accountability and transparency, it is nonetheless completely unacceptable. Despite these accounting tricks, the Liberals cannot hide from the fact that every dollar they spend comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians, causing higher prices, lower paycheques and bigger bills.

In addition to massively increasing Canada's debt, budget 2025 fails to address the housing crisis so many Canadians are facing. Since the Liberals took office, housing prices have risen 32% faster than incomes in this country, turning Canada into the most unaffordable housing market in the G7. Despite the Prime Minister's promise to build 500,000 homes annually at speeds not seen for generations, his own agency confirmed that new home construction dropped 17% this past October alone, falling to less than half of his target. The president of the Building Industry and Land Development Association revealed the Liberals' misleading claims in the budget.

He reported:

This budget relies on backward-looking data that provides false reassurances that Canada's housing sector is prospering and that affordability is improving. But these are stale statistics. The latest figures show that new home sales have evaporated across all housing types in every major city across Canada – and a hundred thousand jobs are at risk.

It is not just industry leaders who are concerned about the Liberal housing plan; the Liberal member for Beaches—East York, the Prime Minister's former minister of housing, said that the housing measures in budget 2025 are, unfortunately, very “unlikely to move the needle on development”. To use his own phrasing, budget 2025 “falls well short” of addressing the Liberal housing promises and “does not live up to its promise of generational investments.” If the Liberals want to get serious about restoring housing affordability, they should get out of the way and scrap the red tape and taxes that make it impossible to build.

The promise of Canada has always been that every person, no matter where they are from, can work hard and build a life with a stable job, an affordable home and a strong future in the freest country on earth. Unfortunately, after 10 years of Liberal mismanagement, that promise has become increasingly out of reach. When the Liberals took office in 2015, Canada ranked number nine on the global quality of life index. After 10 years of reckless Liberal spending and mismanagement, Canada has fallen to 27th place, the largest drop of any of the top 30 countries.

Therefore, on behalf of the Canadians who can no longer afford to eat, heat or house themselves because of Liberal inflation, Conservatives do not support any aspect of this costly budget. We will continue to put forward amendments to improve Canada's quality of life by cutting taxes on groceries, work, energy and homebuilding. We will fight to restore the promise of Canada. My hope is that all parties in the House will work with us to deliver a positive, hopeful and affordable future.

• (1605)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhat unfortunate that the Conservatives want to portray this false impression of Canada with respect to the deficit and the debt. The member himself refers to the G7. How is Canada doing in the G7? We are talking about Germany, Italy, France, Japan, England, the United States and Canada. We have the second-lowest GDP deficit, beaten only by Japan. When it comes to the debt, we are in fact the lowest in the GDP. The Conservatives know that. We have the International Monetary Fund's general manager saying how Canada is in a great position to use its fiscal responsibility to invest. That is what this budget is doing.

Why does the member not have the confidence to invest in Canada and Canadians at this time?

**Glen Motz:** Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear my colleague from across the way. I am concerned about his health, as excited as he gets all the time with his questions. The part that troubles me is that we can have all this rhetoric from the other side, from the government, about what is happening with the economy and how well we are doing in comparison to other countries. However, I listen to the people in my riding; I hear stories from across the country, and they are all the same.

### *Government Orders*

I talked to a guy by the name of Bob, a senior from my riding, who called me on Friday afternoon. He has to sell his home because he cannot afford to live any longer. He cannot afford his groceries, cannot afford utilities on his house, insurance on his house. He cannot afford any of that stuff, and he cannot afford to rent once he sells his house. This is the reality people face in this country. We can have all the rhetoric we want about how well we think we are doing as a country, but the reality is that people in this country cannot afford to live. When is that going to change?

[*Translation*]

**Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as we saw in the budget, health transfers will be indexed at a rate that is lower than the increase in system costs. This means that, at the end of the day, Quebec taxpayers will either have to pay more taxes or receive poorer quality services. The other alternative is that Quebec will have to take on more debt to finance health care services.

The government, through the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, continues to misinform the public by saying that Canada has the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, when that does not include the provinces. The Liberals are comparing us to Japan, which is a unitary state.

When provincial debts are included—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Jean-Denis Garon:** Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I have been interrupted several times.

[*English*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. I will ask members to keep the crosstalk down.

I am going to both sides. We will have questions and comments on debate, but there is a member trying to ask a question, and the crosstalk does not serve anyone.

[*Translation*]

I will ask the member for Mirabel to repeat his question.

**Jean-Denis Garon:** Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North, who is more interested in chatting and fooling around than he is in listening to the debate, did not include the provinces in the debt-to-GDP ratio he gave us for Canada. That omission obscures the fact that, if provincial debt is included, Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio is 10% higher than Germany's.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons compared us to Japan, which is a unitary state. He ignored the fact that by insufficiently indexing health transfers, the federal government is shifting the financial burden to the provinces. Talking about Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio without including the provinces is misinformation.

Would my colleague agree with that?

*Government Orders**[English]*

**Glen Motz:** Mr. Speaker, I was going to say in French that my colleague is absolutely correct. I thank him for the information. I thank him for the realization that the government fails to recognize, which is that it can use all the accounting tricks it wants, but the reality is that we have a debt problem in this country. We have a debt problem for consumers, for governments and for businesses, which are struggling to make ends meet. We can have all the tricks in the world with the operating and the capital budget, and all that accounting, saying, “It is not here; it is over here. We can have the public lose track of it”, but I say no. There is one debt payer, and there is one debt. It is costing us a fortune. This \$55.6 billion will continue to go up every year because of the government's reckless spending and mismanagement of our taxpayer dollars.

- (1610)

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is very troubling what we hear from the Liberals when we bring up plants closing in British Columbia, mills closing and thousands of people losing jobs; they say there are supports. When there are automobile lines closing down and moving down to the States, they say there are supports.

Does the member agree with me that workers do not want supports; they want their jobs?

**Glen Motz:** Mr. Speaker, absolutely. It is interesting when the government rolls out these socialist programs to people who want to have a job, keep their job and be able to afford to feed their own children. They want to be able to afford to keep their house and have a job and a future for their children. This is not what has been happening over these last 10 years with the government. Yes, people want to look after themselves and not depend on government handouts.

**Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of Bill C-15, the budget implementation act.

The legislation is more than a collection of policies and tax changes; it is a blueprint for building a stronger, more resilient Canada at a time when we face major global and economic challenges.

For decades, our prosperity has relied on stable international trade rules and open markets. However, today, the rules-based system and long-time trade relationships, including with our closest partner, the United States, are being disrupted. Canadian firms are facing new barriers. Supply chains are under pressure. Jobs and livelihoods depend on our ability to adapt.

This means that Canada must build a bigger, more innovative economy here at home, faster than ever before. We must diversify our markets, mobilize investment and unleash the full potential of Canadian workers and businesses.

Bill C-15 moves us decisively in that direction. It would grow our economy, build homes people can afford, make life more affordable and protect the environment while opening the door to a new generation of clean economic growth.

Budget 2025 is unapologetically an investment budget. We are making generational investments in infrastructure, clean technology, housing and the skills Canadians need to thrive. We must do so while maintaining higher environmental standards.

The legislation helps unlock the goal of catalyzing \$1 trillion of investment over five years from provinces, municipalities, indigenous partners and the private sector. We are attracting capital by creating certainty, providing incentives and fast-tracking the infrastructure that will power our economy for decades to come. We are doing it responsibly.

Canada enters this moment with the strongest credit rating in the world, the lowest long-term interest rates in the G7 and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio of any major economy. International experts, including from the IMF, have said that Canada is pursuing strategic progrowth investment, and they project that we will have the second-strongest economic growth in the G7 in 2026.

In a changing world, we cannot rely on any single market. That is why the government is launching a trade diversification strategy that will double Canadian exports beyond the U.S. within a decade. Bill C-15 supports that goal by aligning our tax system with global competitiveness, boosting innovation and giving businesses the tools they need to grow and survive. The bill would support small- and medium-sized businesses, the backbone of our economy. This is an economy built by Canadians for Canadians.

Budget 2025 delivers the support our communities have been asking for through the new build communities strong fund, a \$51 billion investment in local infrastructure over the next decade. This fund will help municipalities build the roads, water systems, community centres and, importantly, the health care facilities that growing communities desperately need.

Within this fund is a dedicated health infrastructure fund, providing \$5 billion over three years to upgrade and expand hospitals and urgent care services. In Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, residents rely on nearby hospital systems, such as the Scarborough Health Network and the Toronto East Health Network. These systems often depend on extensive community fundraising just to modernize the emergency departments or to replace aging equipment. That model is not sustainable on its own. This fund will help ensure frontline care is not dependent on charity but backed by strong federal partnership.

We cannot build a strong economy without building homes people can afford. Housing is not just a social need; it is an economic necessity. Businesses will not invest if workers cannot live near where their jobs are. I have spoken to many families in my riding of Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East for whom home ownership seems to be a dream that is increasingly out of reach and for whom finding sustainable and affordable rental housing is difficult, if not impossible.

• (1615)

Bill C-15 would tackle this head-on. It would provide an accelerated capital cost allowance for purpose-built rentals, would make new investments through Build Canada Homes and would extend the enhanced GST rental rebate to co-operative housing and student residences. These measures would help get shovels in the ground faster.

Through budget 2025 and this legislation, we would create pathways for major housing investments and unlock municipal partnerships. We would support agricultural co-operatives, indigenous communities, students and working families.

We know Canadians are feeling squeezed. Bill C-15 would bring relief. It would extend eligibility for charitable donations, would expand the disability supports deduction and would exempt the Canada disability benefit from taxable income. Many of my constituents have asked for this and have told me how important it is that we strengthen and safeguard the Canada disability benefit from provincial clawbacks. Bill C-15 would also introduce a temporary tax credit for individuals whose non-refundable tax credits exceed the first income bracket, putting more money back in the pockets of lower- and middle-income Canadians.

Affordability is not just about taxes; it is also about care. That is why I will push to ensure that our work does not stop with respect to child care. We must continue to expand access, improve wages and workplace standards in this sector, and ensure that families in every region benefit from \$10-a-day child care.

We must also protect and expand pharmacare. Canadians should never have to choose between groceries and prescriptions. Bill C-15 would lay the groundwork to ensure pharmaceutical manufacturing here at home in Canada and ensure better access to essential medicines. I will fight to make sure this momentum continues because health care must include pharmacare.

Climate action is not just a moral duty; it is an economic strategy. Countries that lead the clean economy will lead the 21st century. Canada already has an 85% clean electricity grid and some of the world's richest critical mineral deposits. The clean economy should be Canada's economic advantage, and this bill would help to make that vision a reality.

We would extend investment tax credits for clean technology until 2035, support clean electricity generation from waste biomass and create incentives for polymetallic manufacturing. This would power a clean economy while cutting emissions and protecting our environment. We must do this responsibly. We must build, but build right.

### *Government Orders*

That is why I will continue to insist that every major project meets the highest environmental standards. We can and must have economic growth and environmental protection together. We would accelerate nation-building infrastructure. The high-speed rail network act would move forward faster rail transportation between Quebec and Ontario under full Impact Assessment Act oversight, ensuring transparency, consultation and strong environmental protection.

This legislation is the foundation for a new era of nation building. It supports child care and pharmacare. It would build clean-energy projects. It would fast-track critical infrastructure, and it would protect Canadians from consumer fraud, environmental risk and financial instability. Bill C-15 would also establish the consumer-driven banking act, giving Canadians secure control over their own financial data and making our banks more competitive and responsive to consumer needs.

Across this bill, the message is clear: Canada will depend less on others and build more at home. We will build projects faster, train workers better, attract investment earlier and open more markets for Canadian goods and services. We are not seeking to simply weather the uncertainty that surrounds us; we are choosing to meet it with confidence, resilience and ambition.

This is our moment to build. We cannot wait for the world to settle. We must build Canada's strength now by investing in our people, our infrastructure, our innovation and our environment.

Bill C-15 would build housing Canadians can afford. It would make life more affordable. It would protect health care and move us toward stronger pharmacare and child care. It would put workers first, and it would turn climate action into a competitive advantage for Canadians.

In the face of global uncertainty, this government is focused on what we can control. What we can control is our ability to build an economy that is more independent, more innovative, more inclusive and more resilient than ever before.

*Government Orders*

• (1620)

**Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with a lot of what the member had to say about the need to diversify our export markets and increase non-U.S. exports. For many years, Conservatives have been saying that the northern gateway pipeline project would be a welcomed way to increase our non-U.S. exports. In order for that project to move forward, the Liberals would have to repeal Bill C-48, the west coast tanker ban.

Can the hon. member share her thoughts and views with the House on repealing Bill C-48 so that the northern gateway pipeline project can move forward?

**Salma Zahid:** Mr. Speaker, for any pipeline project to go forward, there should be consultations. All projects should meet our strict environmental standards. I will make sure that any projects that move forward go ahead with proper consultation and after looking at environmental impacts.

[*Translation*]

**Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to clarify a few points. When she reviewed the budget, did she see any investments for the administration of justice? For example, we are currently studying Bill C-9 and will soon be studying Bill C-14, which has been referred to committee. We are therefore talking about administering prison sentences, increasing sentences and establishing minimum sentences, among other things.

Does the budget include measures for rehabilitating those who are sent to our prisons and penitentiaries? Are there measures to work with social agencies on prevention in order to reduce rising crime rates in Canada? What measures are in the budget to fight crime in Canada?

[*English*]

**Salma Zahid:** Mr. Speaker, of course, on this side of the House, we are committed to making sure that crime levels go down, because it is very important that every Canadian live safely. Every mother should have the satisfaction of knowing that if their young children go out, they will return home safely. That is why we want to get guns off our streets.

I hope hon. members will join me in supporting the bail and sentencing reform act, which would make Canadians safer. I hear from my constituents about it every day, and we will do the work necessary to make sure we put an end to crime.

• (1625)

**Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on her excellent remarks.

At the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that separating operating and capital expenditures is, in fact, a best practice. It is a best practice in government and it is a best practice in private industry. He said it allows us to track investments from both a budget perspective and a reporting perspective.

Today, I was delighted to hear my colleague speak to the importance of investments. I welcome her views on where she will see further investments in her riding.

**Salma Zahid:** Mr. Speaker, I want to reaffirm that this is an investment budget. We were elected in April on the promise of investing in Canadians and reducing our operating expenses. The build communities strong fund is a great example of how we are investing directly in our communities. It is the first time in the history of Canada that there is money dedicated directly to investment in the health care sector. It will put investments in the health care system and in local hospitals, which my constituents rely on.

We will see investments in our community centres, in better infrastructure and in better roads. These are investments that our community members rely on. It is important that right now, in these circumstances, we invest in Canadians and make sure that we build a bolder, stronger Canada.

**Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago, Canadians went to the polls, and we all know what was top of mind for voters: It was affordability. For 10 years, under these same Liberals, affordability was thrown to the side. Our country's spending was mismanaged. They spent all the money they could and took no responsibility for the public purse.

Then came the current Prime Minister. During the election, he told Canadians he would be different and would not be like his predecessor, Justin Trudeau. He said that he would be responsible. The Prime Minister persuaded Canadians that they could judge him by the cost at the grocery store.

Many Canadians were not fooled. They knew, after 10 years, who the Liberals were. They voted for common-sense Conservatives, and now we have the largest opposition in years, with 25 new seats. I am proud to be one of the new MPs in this House. I was elected by the common-sense people of Edmonton Southeast, who wanted to fix this budget.

I recently met with one of my constituents who is from the U.K. She made it clear why our Prime Minister, the former governor of the Bank of England, should not be the Prime Minister of Canada after what he did to that country. She was not misled, but many Canadians were misled. They believed the Prime Minister would be different from his predecessor, Justin Trudeau.

With this first budget, which is the first real test of the Prime Minister, he proved that he is no different from Justin Trudeau. Like Liberals often do, they say one thing to Canadians and do the other. They misled voters. This is the same budget, if not worse, that we saw during the 10 years of Justin Trudeau.

*Government Orders*

Here are some of the promises the new Liberal Prime Minister broke. The Prime Minister promised a deficit no bigger than \$62 billion, but what we got is a deficit of nearly \$80 billion. This is \$16 billion more than he promised and twice the size of the deficit left by Justin Trudeau. Who would have believed it was possible to spend more than Justin Trudeau?

I am sure someone told the Prime Minister when he took office that he had big shoes to fill, but I do not believe this is what was meant. He is spending the most in Canadian history outside of the pandemic and is doing so with a smile. Every hour, \$10 million is being added to the national debt. This is proof that he is no different than the Liberals have been in the past 10 years.

The Prime Minister also promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio, but the analysis provided by the Parliamentary Budget Officer says otherwise. The PBO found that the debt-to-GDP ratio will be even higher than it was in the last economic update, and Canada is no longer projected to be on a declining path over the medium term.

In last fall's economic statement, it was noted that a declining debt-to-GDP ratio was "key not only for fiscal sustainability, but also to preserve Canada's AAA credit rating, which helps maintain investors' confidence and keeps Canada's borrowing costs as low as possible." By allowing the debt-to-GDP ratio to get higher, the Prime Minister is not only adding debt; he is also making our debt expensive.

If it continues down this road, Canada will be unable to handle a lower credit rating and increased borrowing costs. The amount being paid on borrowing costs is already higher than the revenue brought in from the GST. Yes, the 5% levy on almost everything we buy in Canada is essentially only covering our debt servicing cost.

Think about where all the money could go if we were fiscally responsible and started reducing the amount of debt and debt servicing we have to pay. Our health care system is in shambles. Millions of Canadians cannot get a doctor or specialist and often go to emergency rooms. Imagine if more of our dollars could go to doctors, nurses and hospitals instead of just paying off old debt. By creating more debt, we are making this problem worse. The future generation will pay more.

• (1630)

Look at the system now. It is already overloaded. What do people think the system will be like for our children? They will be paying off the ridiculous spending of the lost Liberal decade for much longer than we will be alive.

The Liberal Prime Minister also promised he would invest more. "Spend less...invest more" has been the tag line of the budget, but in the budget itself, at page 38, there is a graph showing that in every quarter of this year, private sector business investment will fall. Who would have thought that the Prime Minister, an investor, banker and economist by trade, would see private sector investment fall under his watch?

Even before he was the current Prime Minister, he was Trudeau's economic adviser. He is responsible for the problem, which is proven by the fact that he would not invest in Canada. It was not

that long ago that the Prime Minister was moving his Brookfield operations to the United States. It is only with taxpayer dollars that the Prime Minister is interested in investing in Canada. Even then, with our money, he is misleading about the investment in Canada. It has become clear that he has cooked the books.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed this, saying that the Prime Minister's definition of capital spending in the budget was "overly expansive". It defies international accounting standards. In the budget, the Liberals lumped corporate tax breaks and subsidies in with capital spending. Within international public accounting norms, we cannot consider this to be real capital formation. According to the PBO, the government's real capital spending is 30% lower than it claimed. That is a \$94-billion difference. The Liberals cooked the books and are getting caught. It is no wonder they want to get rid of the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

The PBO also found that the budget will not even balance the government's operating budget over the next five years, abandoning what has been a key fiscal anchor. Very quickly, Canadians have learned that "spend less...invest more" really means otherwise; it means spending more and investing less.

Let me recap the broken promises. The Prime Minister broke his promise on the deficit. He broke his promise on the debt-to-GDP ratio. He broke his promise on investing more. In less than a year, the Prime Minister is showing us very quickly that the government is the same old Liberal government we have had for 10 years, maybe even worse. It is not what Canadians voted for. It is not what they want.

Conservatives could not support the budget. I am very proud of my vote against it. I am proud because my constituents voted for affordability. They are struggling.

Let me remind the House of the cost of living crisis due to 10 years of Liberal spending. Over the past year, the price of coffee has gone up 34%. Carrots are up 11%; beef, 17%; oranges, 7%; baby formula, 6%; telephone services, 8%; rent, over 5% and new vehicles, 4.5%. Do members know what is not going up this year? Paycheques, home ownership and the standard of living are not.

The people of Edmonton Southeast are fed up with Liberal spending. Conservatives will continue to stand up for Canadians and affordability. There must be no more cooked Liberal books.

*Government Orders*

● (1635)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan, The Economy; the hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, Veterans Affairs.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the number one issue I sensed at the door in the last federal election was the issue of Trump, tariffs and trade. People were genuinely concerned in regard to Canada's economy and the impact the issue was going to have. The Prime Minister made a commitment to Canadians to look at ways in which we can expand trade opportunities beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border. We will be patient, and we will work toward getting the best deal for Canadians on the U.S.A.-Canada-Mexico deal, going forward.

Does the member support the initiatives that the Prime Minister has taken in recent months to support expanding exports, whether it is with Korea, Indonesia, Philippines, India or England, and beyond?

**Jagsharan Singh Mahal:** Mr. Speaker, I honestly like that the senior member of the Liberals can speak for hours without saying anything or making any sense.

To answer his question, I want to say that the Prime Minister has been to the U.S., and there has been no progress. He has been to India, and India has increased tariffs on peas. He has been to China, and there are increased tariffs. He has been to England, and our beef exports are not at the level of what it is exporting to Canada.

The Prime Minister is touring country to country, a new country every time, but he comes back with literally nothing.

[*Translation*]

**Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, earlier on, the Liberal member for Mount Royal tried to convince us that Quebec's Bill 2 is what weakened the health care system, when in fact years of chronic underfunding are to blame for Quebec and the provinces' struggles to meet their obligation to care for people.

The budget contains absolutely nothing for health care, apart from a measly \$5 billion over three years for infrastructure. However, we know full well that a single hospital expansion project in Quebec can wind up costing about \$4 billion. Does my colleague not think it is obscene that we are ending up with a \$72-billion deficit, yet health care is not a priority?

[*English*]

**Jagsharan Singh Mahal:** Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed I do. There has been the same situation in my riding of Edmonton Southeast, where a hospital was projected to be built, with earlier costs set at \$1.5 billion. The province had to push that because the cost is now over \$5 billion.

The cuts that the government is making to essential services and to critical things like hospitals do not make sense. The amount allocated in the budget, \$5 billion nationwide, is just peanuts, nothing but a joke to the health care system, which is already broken.

● (1640)

**Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleague from Edmonton Southeast for his excellent speech and his passion in fighting for his constituents.

The Prime Minister said that he should be judged by the price of groceries in the grocery aisles, while we know he does not actually go to any grocery stores. We do know that grocery price inflation is growing 40% faster in Canada than it is in the U.S. There was the shocking study out of Dalhousie University last week that said that 80.6% of Canadians tag food costs as their number one price inflation and pressure concern in their budgets.

I would like to ask my colleague whether he is hearing that from his constituents in Edmonton. What is his reaction to the budget and its lack of ability to address that affordability challenge?

**Jagsharan Singh Mahal:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his genuine, common-sense question on affordability.

The Prime Minister has failed badly on affordability. Canadians have already given him an F grade on his promise that he can be judged by how much groceries cost at the grocery store.

That said, there are over 5,000 homeless people in Edmonton Southeast. I do not see anything in the budget on affordability for people who do not have jobs or who meet low-income criteria. I am not satisfied with the budget nor with the steps the government has taken. It has failed to take into consideration the people who are struggling with the lack of jobs.

**Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here speaking to budget 2025, a Canada strong budget, and, specifically, elaborating on actions the Government of Canada has proposed to take on housing and infrastructure. I will share how the government is building on previous investments in housing by introducing more options for Canadians who need housing they can attain.

Federal efforts require construction and funding that can deliver. In response, the Government of Canada has outlined a comprehensive framework for moving forward, one that would accelerate the construction of affordable housing at scale. On September 14, 2025, the Government of Canada launched Build Canada Homes with an initial capitalization of \$13 billion.

*Government Orders*

Build Canada Homes has a mandate to move quickly, marked by the Prime Minister's announcement of its first four investments and initiatives. It complements measures the government has introduced to remove local barriers, reduce development costs, fund essential infrastructure and incentivize purpose-built rentals. It leverages programs like the Canada housing infrastructure fund, the Canada community-building fund, the Canada public transit fund and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's housing programs, such as the apartment construction loan program and mortgage loan insurance products, to make projects viable.

Build Canada Homes is Canada's new federal agency, with the mandate to scale up the supply of affordable housing across Canada. By leveraging public lands and acting as a catalyst for modern methods of construction, Build Canada Homes is driving a more productive and innovative homebuilding sector. Build Canada Homes works differently than previous government entities by combining flexible financial tools, including low-interest loans, equity investments, contributions and guarantees. With land access and development expertise under one roof, it will make large-scale mixed-market developments financially viable and attract private capital and safeguard long-term affordability. The agency will work in partnership to reduce risk, address barriers and guide projects through the development phases.

By prioritizing modern methods of construction such as factory-built housing, Build Canada Homes will spark a more productive homebuilding industry, creating a steady demand for factory-built housing, which is expected to speed up delivery, reduce costs and improve sustainability. Working in partnership with non-profits, indigenous organizations, private developers and all orders of government, Build Canada Homes is accelerating the delivery of housing that Canadians need: faster, smarter and more affordable.

On November 22, 2025, Build Canada Homes released its investment policy framework, marking a significant milestone in its mission to accelerate the delivery of affordable housing across Canada. The investment policy framework establishes clear investment priorities, guiding principles and eligibility criteria, creating a more flexible, strategic and outcome-driven approach to housing development.

Under the investment policy framework, Build Canada Homes will prioritize projects that are ready to build, affordable and collaborative, with a strong emphasis on partnerships. Projects will leverage modern construction methods like modular and factory-built housing to cut costs and speed up delivery. Projects will also use Canadian materials to strengthen supply chains and support local manufacturing.

Through this framework, Build Canada Homes will leverage public capital to unlock stalled projects, will attract private and philanthropic investment, and will scale up innovative construction methods that reduce costs and accelerate delivery. The initial focus will be on shovel-ready projects that are financially sustainable and capable of generating long-term community impact, with particular emphasis on housing for low- and moderate-income households.

• (1645)

To support projects that deliver long-term affordability, sustainability and community benefit, Build Canada Homes will offer a

suite of flexible financial options, including low-interest loans, equity investments, contributions and guarantees. Proposals will be evaluated on affordability outcomes, speed of delivery, financial viability and long-term community impact. The Canada Infrastructure Bank gets infrastructure projects built by leveraging private and institutional capital. The government will continue to leverage its expertise to find key strategic investments on a national scale.

In budget 2025, the “Canada Strong” budget, the Government of Canada announced its intention to amend the Canada Infrastructure Bank to increase the Canada Infrastructure Bank's statutory capital envelope from \$35 billion to \$45 billion. With this amount, the Canadian Infrastructure Bank will be able to invest more and more rapidly across its established sectors as well as in projects that have been referred to the Major Projects Office, regardless of sector or asset class, as long as they fall within the bank's legal mandate. This will unlock more projects with the partnership of private investment.

Budget 2025 also announced that the Canada Infrastructure Bank's target for investments in indigenous infrastructure that benefits first nations, Inuit and Métis communities across its priority sectors will increase from at least \$1 billion to at least \$3 billion. The government will work with first nations, Inuit and Métis partners to identify and support indigenous housing needs and priorities.

Richmond, my hometown, is one of Canada's most desirable housing markets. To help address affordability, the government created the housing accelerator fund to expedite construction. That fund is supporting the construction of at least 220 affordable rental units in Richmond, and the rapid housing initiative added another 25 units for women and women with children. I am working closely with the city to deliver more.

To streamline federal efforts and leverage development expertise, responsibility for Canada Lands Company has been transferred under the portfolio of the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure. As part of the federal government's bold response to Canada's housing crisis, Canada Lands Company's land and development expertise is transferring under the newly launched Build Canada Homes. This marks a strategic shift in how federal lands and development expertise are mobilized to accelerate affordable housing delivery across the country.

*Government Orders*

Build Canada Homes will apply a direct build approach to oversee and lead the construction of affordable, mixed-income communities. The direct build approach is one example of how Build Canada Homes will work to improve the availability of affordable housing for those who have been priced out of the market.

The Government of Canada has set out a long-term, comprehensive and flexible plan to make housing more affordable and accessible for Canadians. Build Canada Homes will change the way we build homes in this country. Bringing forward ambitious and practical solutions, the agency will not act alone. It will work in close partnership with developers, investors, manufacturers, provinces, municipalities and territories, as well as indigenous partners, to get housing financed and built. Build Canada Homes is an integral part of a broader range of Government of Canada measures to increase the supply of housing, make housing more affordable and accessible, and lead to transformative change in Canada's housing system. Its model exemplifies the work our government is doing to accelerate growth and help make Canada the strongest economy in the G7.

• (1650)

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to let my colleague know that he is always welcome to come back to OGGO. All is forgiven. I know he left us recently.

One of the major platforms on housing from the Liberals during the last election was what is called the MURB, or multi-unit residential building, tax provision to build rental units. The government has not put it anywhere in the budget.

Why has the government broken the promise it made in the election campaign to reintroduce this tax incentive?

**Parm Bains:** Mr. Speaker, the member does great work at the mighty OGGO committee, which I miss dearly.

I like the MURB program. I think it is a fantastic model where Canadians can engage, help, and be part of the solution to build more homes. With respect to how that framework works, there is still a lot of work to do.

I am happy to speak with the member across some time to talk about how we can implement some of those solutions to get the MURB program going, but if we look at the measures that have been taken right now, they are bold measures. They bring one entity together with multiple programs to help efficiently move these programs forward to build homes for Canadians.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my friend made reference to the Canada Infrastructure Bank. I love the contrast between the Liberals and the Conservatives on that particular institution. The member said it is a valuable part of investing in Canada. In fact, in British Columbia, there are at least a half dozen multi-million dollar megaprojects that are taking place in B.C. through the Canada Infrastructure Bank. The Conservatives, on the other hand, want to get rid of the Canada Infrastructure Bank. They constantly criticize it.

I wonder if my colleague could provide his thoughts on why it is important that we support investing in Canada and investing in Canadians.

**Parm Bains:** Mr. Speaker, the Canada Infrastructure Bank does amazing work.

My time right now is being spent at the industry and technology committee. Every witness we have had at that committee has talked about reinvesting in Canada, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank helps us do that.

I can give an example: In my hometown of Richmond, British Columbia, there is a district energy project that the Canada Infrastructure Bank is going to fund that will be providing energy for 25 new towers at Lansdowne Centre, right in the middle of Richmond, B.C. We are looking forward to that project getting going.

**Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot get enough of the member opposite since he left OGGO.

The Prime Minister, in this very House, stated he would have “declining...debt.” The budget they put out actually has \$169 billion more debt than that of the previous prime minister, Trudeau, who was not exactly known as someone who would look toward saving Canadians' money.

Why did the Prime Minister state in the House that he was going to be lowering the debt, when in fact he has increased it by \$169 billion over that of the previous government?

• (1655)

**Parm Bains:** Mr. Speaker, if the member looks at the plan that the Prime Minister has introduced for lowering the debt, it is the first time in Canadian history that we have seen an operational budget that has been split from an investment, or capital spending, budget. It was outlined in budget 2025, the “Canada Strong” budget, that \$60 billion of operational spending will be reduced in the next five years. I think those are the savings the member may have missed.

[*Translation*]

**Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois voted against the budget speech. In fact, 22 Bloc members stood up and remained true to their values and their word.

A month before the budget, we made it clear to the government what our expectations were. The government refused to discuss anything, negotiate or speak with us. It refused to listen to Quebeckers' concerns. The day we voted against the budget, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and the Minister of Finance and National Revenue used the word “mystified”. They were mystified that we had voted against the budget. It was even La Presse's word of the week. Those folks are so out of touch that, for a month, they refused to speak with the opposition parties so, in the end, they governed by mystification. That is how it played out.

Not only did we vote against the budget, but now we have no doubt that we made the right choice. Following the vote on the speech, the budget implementation bill was introduced. We realized that this government's lack of transparency went much further than we originally thought.

In the spring, and with the support of the Conservatives, they passed Bill C-5 under closure, claiming that it was urgent for their major projects of national interest. We knew there was no urgency, that they did not even need to use it. Today, however, the 603-page budget bill reveals on page 301 how far this government is willing to go to circumvent Parliament and flout laws, regulations, and democracy.

Proposed section 12 states on page 301 that as soon as a minister thinks it might be good for innovation, they can suspend any provision of a federal law or federal regulation other than the Criminal Code. This is no joke. According to the budget bill, what was hidden from the public in the budget is that, if this measure is adopted, a minister could wake up one morning and decide to suspend environmental laws, transportation safety laws, and foreign policy laws. A minister can do whatever they want. It was not even in the budget speech. Reading the implementation bill, we realize that voting against it was absolutely the right thing to do.

Why did we vote against it? Allow me to give a few reasons. Quebec and the provinces asked for \$100 billion in infrastructure over 10 years. That represents \$10 billion a year, or \$2.2 billion a year for Quebec. That is not a lot. When we look at the budget, how much new money is there for infrastructure over five years? Over five years, we have \$9 billion. We need to take \$5 billion out of that to build hospitals. As my colleague from Montcalm said earlier today, how can we build hospitals from coast to coast to coast with only \$5 billion? That is what it costs for a single hospital.

In fact, new infrastructure investment is \$4 billion. The Government of Quebec has done its own calculations and estimates the projected amount to be \$22 billion over 10 years, which is consistent with our own calculation. Today, at the Standing Committee on Finance, we asked the Parliamentary Budget Officer how much new funding was planned for infrastructure. He replied that the government had not yet given him enough information to come up with an exact number. However, he clarified that this amount falls far short of the \$115 billion requested.

It is one thing for the Minister of Finance and National Revenue to make the rounds of every TV network in Canada, exaggerating, indulging in hyperbole and putting on a show. However, the reality is that people were not heard. That is one reason to vote against this bill.

The same goes for health transfers. The one-off agreements with the provinces that the Trudeau government signed are about to expire. As a result, health transfers are going to decrease starting next year and grow at a slower rate than system spending. That means today, the federal government is telling Quebecers that they have to choose between paying more Quebec taxes, making do with reduced services and increasing Quebec's debt.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government keeps telling the House that Canada has the best debt-to-GDP ratio

### *Government Orders*

in the G7, yet he neglects to include provincial debt. He counts the federal debt and ignores the provincial debt.

Under the Maastricht treaty, a country's debt includes the debts of its non-central entities. By no international standard does the government's math make any sense, but that does not stop it from boasting.

• (1700)

The government is telling the provinces that they should incur debt on Ottawa's behalf so that it can maintain a good debt-to-GDP ratio.

There is not a penny for the rapid housing initiative, even though Quebec is the only province with permanent social and community housing construction programs. What is more, Quebec generally does not receive its share of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's programs, which is 22% of the envelope. We had asked that this envelope, which works for housing, to be refinanced, but there is nothing in the budget.

Instead, the government chose to create a new entity, a new bureaucracy, known as Build Canada Homes. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is going to be in on it, yet it is not even a bank and has never actually built infrastructure. The only good thing about its name is that it is Canadian. They are trying to tell us that this will result in faster housing construction, even though the solution already exists.

We called for the \$814 million stolen from Quebec to be paid back to Quebecers, but that is not in the budget. That is another reason to vote against the budget. The Liberals bought votes by using the consolidated revenue fund in Ottawa to pay people in seven provinces for carbon tax rebates that no one ever paid. Quebecers contributed \$814 million to the vote-buying in provinces other than Quebec, and the Minister of Finance and National Revenue told Quebecers to take a hike. In the same breath, he said he was mystified that the Bloc Québécois was voting against the budget.

The 125 members of the National Assembly unanimously called for that money to be paid back. This included their Liberal friend Pablo Rodriguez, who voted with the Liberals when he was a minister, but then began voting with the Bloc Québécois when he became an independent member because he realized that he had never defended the interests of Quebec. There are 42 Liberal members across the aisle who are voting against Quebec and against the National Assembly, because they are getting their voting instructions from Toronto and Saskatchewan. That is another reason to vote against the budget.

*Government Orders*

There is nothing for seniors. The Liberals are the ones who created two classes of seniors. The legal age of retirement in Canada is 65. The Liberals boast about having brought the age back to 65. However, between 65 and 74, it is not good to be retired. People have to wait until they reach 75 to be treated the same as other retirees. This weekend, *Le Journal de Montréal* published a comprehensive report on poverty among retirees. We were asking for fairness. We asked that the OAS benefit be the same for seniors aged 65 to 74 as it is for seniors aged 75 and over, but the Liberals are mystified that we voted against the budget.

There is nothing for first-time home buyers who do not have a mommy or daddy or grandma or grandpa to max their tax-free savings account for first-time home buyers to fuel bidding wars in the real estate market. There is nothing. Our proposal would have cost about \$200 million to implement from coast to coast. That is another reason to vote against the budget.

On top of that, we have to add in the Liberals' creative accounting. They are saying that FIFA games count as an investment. They are saying that recruiting military personnel is a capital investment and that expanding an early retirement program at CBSA counts as capital. They are saying that tax credits for carbon capture count as capital. I have studied economics my entire life. Either the Liberals are out to lunch, or there is not a single economist in Canada who knows what capital is. These are examples of current expenditures.

Furthermore, the Liberals are telling us that there will be a \$78.5-billion deficit. However, the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates that there is a 7% chance that they will reach that target, because they would need to cut \$60 billion over five years to achieve it. They have identified \$10 billion, but some people do not even think they will even be able to achieve half of that amount. That means that the \$78-billion deficit is a minimum.

If anyone needed reasons for voting down the budget, there are a few. Now, we know the Liberals' answers, written down on little cards by the Prime Minister's Office for Liberal members to read out to us like broken records. They say they are giving the Magdalen Islands a runway and building a shark pavilion, and then they want to know how we would dare vote against the budget.

That is why we, as an opposition party, worked out our priorities. The government had our priorities a month in advance but no constructive phone calls were made. The government has another chance, also known as the Standing Committee on Finance. We have six requests. If the government wants the Bloc Québécois's support, the committee stage offers another opportunity to include the demands of Quebecers and the Bloc Québécois.

• (1705)

**Tim Watchorn (Les Pays-d'en-Haut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a high-level defence gathering at the Halifax International Security Forum.

In the budget, the government announced \$81 billion in defence spending over the next five years. The member and I know that many businesses in Mirabel will benefit from this spending. I would like to know whether he will stand up for the interests of his constituents and their businesses and vote with us to support the

budget so that the riding of Mirabel gets its piece of the defence investment pie.

**Jean-Denis Garon:** Mr. Speaker, during question period these past few days, the Minister of Industry has been rising in the House and attacking me, saying that there was money for defence and that I was working against my riding.

However, the Liberal government is causing the loss of 500 defence jobs in Mirabel because it is incapable of making any kind of decision regarding which fighter jet it is going to purchase. At L3Harris Technologies, between 500 and 600 people might lose their jobs in January. The defence staff, the army and several others have publicly said that a quick decision was needed. However, the government prefers to waffle and risk layoffs in Mirabel.

The Liberals stand here and tell me that voting for the budget will save jobs. What I am telling them is that they need to start getting out and speaking with folks. I met with representatives from L3Harris two weeks ago. Unions, employers and everyone in my riding can see that the government's indecision is costing well-paying jobs in the Lower Laurentians. That is unacceptable.

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians, including Quebecers, want paycheques that will allow them to make ends meet. Right now, that is a struggle and a big challenge. Rent and groceries are a burden every month and every week, respectively.

Does my colleague agree that the Liberal deficit is fuelling the inflation that is affecting the cost of living of ordinary people?

**Jean-Denis Garon:** Mr. Speaker, I think that Quebecers need quality health care.

I also think that the most vulnerable Quebecers, who are seeing bungalows in Mirabel going for \$800,000 or \$900,000, need housing.

What I am also seeing is that Quebecers were robbed by the federal government of \$814 million, which could have helped them get through the crisis on a daily basis. What I am seeing is that the Bloc Québécois' demands were designed to meet all of Quebecers' daily needs. However, the government decided not to pick up the phone and negotiate. Instead, it has turned its back on Quebec. That is what I am seeing.

**Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about issues of justice; it is in my nature. I put my question to Conservative and Liberal members, but I did not receive a response.

My colleague has read the budget, and I would like his opinion. Are there any sections in the budget that talk about investing in rehabilitating the people in our penitentiaries? Is there anything for prevention, so we can improve the situation and slow down the rising crime rates in Canada? That was my first question.

*Government Orders*

Here is my second question. A total of \$814 million was gifted to people out west. If I am not mistaken, Quebecers pay a little over 20% of Canadian taxes. Does that mean we paid 20% of the total amount? If that is the case, and the number is over \$800 million, maybe we need to start crunching some numbers. Quebec is getting the short end of the stick here.

**Jean-Denis Garon:** Mr. Speaker, the vote-buying scheme during the election campaign cost billions of dollars, between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. Quebecers paid for 22% of this total with their own taxes. That amount did not come from carbon tax revenues; it came from the consolidated revenue fund. I know it is strange to say it that way, but the tax was rebated in advance. That is how the program was designed in order to make it socially acceptable. Quebecers paid out of their own pockets for a carbon tax rebate that was never collected.

As far as crime is concerned, there is a lot of talk about crime, about the issues and about what we see on the streets. We have to differentiate between fact and fiction. However, one thing is clear: I do not recall seeing any significant investments in the budget. It is all well and good to legislate, to talk about the problem and to speak out against it, but we also need to make investments, especially investments that are in line with the Quebec model and Quebec's approach to rehabilitation. As far as I know, that money is not in the budget.

• (1710)

**Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, I would like to start by stating a fact: We live in a world of uncertainty.

All of the decisions that we are going to make, whether they are departmental decisions or decisions taken as part of a budget or government strategy, are really decisions that we have to make against the backdrop of a changing world. I speak of change, but I could also use the word “disruption”. We are truly experiencing disruptions, whether in our relationship with our neighbours to the south, at the economic level or in everything we have experienced recently. That is what I mean by the word “disruption”.

That is why I am rising today to discuss the 2025 budget implementation act.

I want to reiterate, as the Minister of Finance has reiterated several times, that this budget will chart a clear path to build, protect and empower our country, Canada. I have said it before, I will say it again, and I cannot say it enough: We are living in uncertain times. As we know, Canadians are going through tough times, with geopolitical turbulence, supply disruptions and, above all, tariffs imposed by our neighbours to the south. All of this is obviously putting real pressure on businesses, families and workers.

In this context, our government will not give in to fear or isolationism. On the contrary, our government made a choice. It chose to act—to act ambitiously, to act clearly and, above all, to act responsibly. Our goal could not be simpler or more important: We want to build the strongest economy in the G7 by protecting Canadians' purchasing power and boosting our capacity to innovate and prosper. We want to invest, but what do we want to invest in?

I will now talk about innovation, research and development. This is a key pillar of the strategy to modernize our tax incentive program for scientific research and experimental development, the much-talked-about SR&ED program. Why? It is because innovation is not a luxury. It is the very foundation of our future prosperity.

I am not speaking in a vacuum. I myself come from an academic background. I come from the field of research, of technological innovation. We know very well that it is essential for any country that truly wants to address the technological challenges that we are facing to respect research and development and to be forward thinking in that regard. I repeat, innovation is not a luxury; it is essential to our future prosperity.

Science fuels innovation, innovation fuels productivity, and productivity is what grows our economy long-term. The SR&ED program is already the most powerful federal tool for encouraging businesses to invest in research. It represents \$4.2 billion per year and primarily benefits small businesses, which account for 64% of all claims filed.

Budget 2025 takes us further. We are enhancing the program by increasing the enhanced rate expenditure limit. This strategic move will help more innovative businesses grow, scale up and invest in Canada rather than investing in other countries. The additional \$440 million injected each year as a result of this enhanced tax credit is expected to generate an economic output of \$1.2 billion. That is a 300% return on investment for our economy. That is a smart investment. That is a responsible investment.

We hear people across the way talking about spending, but they clearly do not understand the economic situation we are in. This is the most critical time, a time to invest. These are investments with a 300% return for our economy. That is a smart and responsible investment.

• (1715)

Now, let us talk about the clean economy investment tax credits. The Bloc Québécois voted against a budget that reinforces the importance of investing in the clean economy, so it cannot stand up now and say that it is the authority on clean energy. That is far from the case, since the Bloc Québécois members voted against a budget that directly helps provide clean energy for all. I think that was irresponsible of them.

The government wants to have a strong economy within the G7, and that means investing in sectors that will shape the world of today and tomorrow. To support population growth, the electrification of transportation, and the increased development of artificial intelligence, a substantial increase in our energy supply is required.

*Government Orders*

Yesterday I heard the president and CEO of Hydro-Québec say that electricity use will increase significantly everywhere, in all households and organizations, and we have heard this in other provinces too. When we see a smart government acting proactively, as our government is doing, it is a credit to our country and to our government, and for that, we should all be proud. That is why tax credits for investment in the clean economy related to electricity are a welcome and essential measure for attracting major industrial projects to the country.

We are also extending by five years the full value of the carbon capture, utilization and storage investment tax credit, a technology that is essential to achieving net zero while maintaining our competitiveness. Finally, we are expanding the list of critical minerals eligible for the clean technology manufacturing investment tax credit. When we talk about clean technologies, we must consider the major components.

During my speech, I spoke about research and development. All the research clearly shows that certain minerals are critical. Antimony, indium, gallium, germanium, scandium are just a few of the critical minerals eligible for the tax credit. The government clearly knows what it is talking about and understands critical minerals. This reflection cannot be done independently, but rather systemically, with interest, and obviously, it needs to go the right way. As I said, these metals are rare, strategic and critical for batteries, telecommunications, semiconductors and the green economy. By recognizing their importance and supporting their extraction, processing and recycling, we strengthen Canada's economic sovereignty and create jobs across the country, including jobs in our beloved province of Quebec.

In conclusion, this budget is not an accounting exercise, but a societal choice. We are making historic investments while preserving Canada's fiscal advantage. We are unleashing Canada's capacity for innovation. We are building a clean, productive and resilient economy. Most importantly, we are giving Canadian businesses the tools they need to succeed and create well-paying jobs—emphasis on “well-paying”.

I am proud to support this bill. I invite all my colleagues to do the same for the good of the economy, innovation, research and development and, most of all, for the future of our country and of Canadians.

I would not want to end my speech without mentioning the sports centre that the people of Bourassa have been waiting for years. This budget will not only build infrastructure and concrete, but it is also building the future of these young people and the future of the citizens of Bourassa. I thank the Minister of Finance for this budget and I thank everyone who contributed to it.

• (1720)

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the Prime Minister was asked if he had any contact with President Trump, and he said that he did not care and that he had no burning issues to discuss with him.

I think that is crazy. Hundreds of thousands of workers have jobs that rely on exports to the United States. I am referring to the forestry, steel and auto industries in particular. How does my col-

league not see that the Prime Minister's comments are irresponsible, just like the Liberals' inflationary budget and its repercussions on the cost of living?

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, I am extremely grateful to my colleague for his question, which gives me the opportunity to address two very important points.

First, we are dealing with a President who changes his mind every day. Second, we are still negotiating. Our government was not the one that stopped the negotiations. That being said, have negotiations stopped? The answer is no. The Prime Minister of Canada is travelling around the world at the moment to diversify our economy and sign agreements with other international partners. The important thing is to support this Prime Minister and this government and congratulate them on their efforts.

**Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the passionate member for Bourassa for his very interesting speech. He spoke about innovation, and he is right: We may disagree on how to go about it, but innovation is important. Speaking of innovation, the budget implementation bill includes a provision hidden deep in the bill, on page 301, under clause 208. The bill would give a minister absolute power to suspend any federal law or regulation—except the Criminal Code, thank goodness—without having to give any specific reason.

Does my colleague not think that this deserves a thorough review in committee, at the very least? Does he not think that this could appear to be an abuse of executive power? It is somewhat similar to what happened with Bill C-5. They claimed it was urgent, but the urgency of resorting to Bill C-5 has yet to materialize.

Does the member not think that this should give us pause and that, despite the need for innovation, the bill may be going a little too far?

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, are we going too far? I would say no, quite the contrary. The member must understand that we are going through a period of disruptions and we need to make significant changes. This also gives me an opportunity to answer the question to some extent. Canada is still one of the G7 countries with the most competitive corporate tax rates. If we do not give the minister the power to assess interest during this period of disruptions, when will we? That is the question I would ask my colleague.

**Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, Bloc members are increasingly being described as watered-down Conservatives. Quebeckers are currently angry with the Bloc Québécois because its positions often align with those of the Conservative Party. It voted against the budget, for example.

My question is this: Do you think it is normal for the Bloc Québécois to make so many decisions that are in line with the Conservatives?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** I would remind the member to ask his questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Bourassa.

*Government Orders*

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the real question is this: What role does the Bloc Québécois play and what place can it really have in Parliament?

What surprises me the most is to see the decisions and positions of the Bloc Québécois increasingly align with those of the Conservatives in a number of committees, not just the finance committee. That really scares me. It bothers me to see that Quebeckers are represented by elected officials whose positions are so closely aligned with Conservative positions.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

[*English*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. Let's keep the crosstalk down a little bit.

Resuming debate, the honorable member for Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North.

**Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House and speak on behalf of the great, smart, hard-working people of Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North.

Tonight we are debating budget 2025, the costliest budget in Canadian history outside COVID.

**An hon. member:** Best budget ever.

**Dan Muys:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would disagree, and I will tell members why for the next 10 minutes.

The first budget presented by the new finance minister promised discipline, responsibility and a new direction. However, every single one of those promises was broken.

Six months ago, the minister promised Canadians a deficit of \$62 billion. In the budget that was presented a couple of weeks ago, it was \$78 billion. He promised a declining debt-to-GDP ratio, but it is rising. In fact, Fitch, the government's own credit rating agency, and the independent Parliamentary Budget Officer, until he is replaced because the Prime Minister does not like to hear challenges to his authority, have warned of credit downgrades. This would add billions more in interest costs. This is alarming.

He promised to spend less and, instead, the budget spends \$90 billion more. That is \$5,400 of extra inflationary spending per household, and that has consequences. He promised help for municipalities, to get Ottawa support in cutting the homebuilding taxes in half. Instead, that promise is gone, and higher housing costs for young people desperate to enter the market are the price of the Prime Minister.

He promised more investment, but the budget itself admits the truth, that private sector investment in Canada is collapsing.

The most alarming number of all is that Canada will spend \$55.6 billion on interest on the debt next year. That is more than all the transfers from the federal government to the provinces for health and more than is collected in GST by the government. To put that in perspective, every single dollar of GST paid by Canadians is not going to doctors, to nurses or to hospitals; it is going to bankers and bondholders. This is not fiscal responsibility. This is not economic

leadership. It is certainly not what the Prime Minister promised Canadians.

When I first rose in the House four years ago to speak on the fall economic statement of 2021, I warned about the dangerous trend that was already appearing: declining investment, falling productivity and a shrinking standard of living. Every year since, when I have spoken on the budget, usually in the spring, I have raised the same warnings. Every year, under the Liberal government, the situation has gotten worse.

Today, Canada's standard of living is in its steepest decline in 40 years. According to the OECD, Canada is on track to have the worst economic growth of all 38 advanced economies over the next four decades, right through to 2060. The productivity gap with the United States is now at its widest since the 1950s, and business investment per worker has fallen to half of what it currently is in the U.S. Since 2014, business investment in Canada has dropped 20%, while in the United States, it has grown by over 70%. This is not a momentary blip. It is a structural decline that is directly tied to policy choices made by the Liberals over the past decade.

I will talk about what this means to the people of Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North, who live in the fast-growing suburban communities of Paris, St. George, Waterdown, Binbrook and Mount Hope. Families are already struggling to make ends meet because they have seen their mortgages increase as they go to renew them.

The Bank of Canada has warned that with millions of mortgages still coming due in 2025 and 2026, some people are facing a 20%, 30% or even 60% increase in payments. That can be \$1,000 or \$1,500 added on to a mortgage payment each month in our region and across Canada. That is really a gut punch to household budgets.

The other thing that they are being squeezed with is grocery prices. They remain painfully expensive. In fact, there was a report last week out of Dalhousie University, which said that 80.6% of Canadians, that is four in five, identify food as the biggest, most pressing expense they are facing.

*Government Orders*

● (1725)

This is in a country where we grow so much food and can export it around the world. Of course, if we had trade deals with certain countries and were not facing the impediments that have resulted since the Prime Minister took office, we would export more. How sad is that? We know that gas and home heating are still higher because the industrial carbon tax remains. We also know that Canadians are working harder but are falling further behind. Affordability is not just a talking point; it is a crisis at kitchen tables.

What worries me are the long-term consequences of this budget, because the finance minister would add \$321.7 billion to the national debt over the next five years. This is more than double what his predecessor would have added, and it would add \$10 million to our debt every hour. These costs are being passed on to Canadian taxpayers, and this inflationary pressure is causing grocery prices to rise and the interest rates on mortgages to be impacted.

The federal debt is now \$1.35 trillion, and what do Canadians get for all of this? It is a GDP growth of 1.1%, which is the second-lowest in the G7. Ten years ago, at the end of a decade of Conservative government, we were the best-performing economy in the G7, but we are no longer today. Unemployment is rising an average of 6.4%. Investments are falling, and as a result, living standards are declining. This is not a plan for prosperity; this budget gambles away Canadian futures.

Across the great riding of Flamborough—Glanbrook—Brant North, there are four fall fairs and there are two summer festivals. I had a booth at each of them this year, as I do every year. My team and I spoke to thousands of people over the course of the 24 days of those fairs and festivals, and two themes were entirely consistent and top of mind among constituents. One was affordability, and the second was the increasing concern that a middle-class life in Canada is no longer possible. I assured them it was not this way 10 years ago, and it will not be this way once the government is replaced.

It does not have to be this way. My parents came as the children of immigrants to Canada. They worked hard. They saved up. They had the belief that every generation should get more and should be stronger. We were not born with a silver spoon in our mouths, but they passed on the middle-class dream of Canada to my brothers and me.

Owning a home was an achievable goal. Building a future was achievable, but for young people today, it is simply out of reach after 10 years of Liberal budgets. Families are feeling squeezed. Young people see no path to home ownership. Entrepreneurs are facing barriers at every turn, and seniors worry about the price of groceries. A senior came into my constituency office during the break week and said they no longer buy beef because it was out of reach for them at the current price. This is someone who had a reasonable pension income from their work in the private sector previously.

Canada should be a place where hard work is rewarded, investment is welcomed and opportunity is rising, not shrinking. Canadians are not asking for perfection, but they are desperately asking for affordability and for a plan that respects their sacrifices, and this budget does not meet that expectation. That is why Conservatives

will oppose this costly, reckless budget if the government will not deliver a budget that helps Canadians.

Conservatives will continue to champion letting workers keep more of every dollar of their paycheque by cutting taxes, making homes affordable by clearing the bureaucracy that blocks building, bringing down food prices by cutting hidden taxes, restoring fiscal responsibility that reins in runaway deficits and rebuilding confidence in our economy so we are attracting investment and rewarding innovators in the Canadian economy. We would open Canada up to those economic opportunities again, not choke it with red tape and debt, as the government has been doing for 10 years. We would build a positive, hopeful future for every Canadian.

● (1730)

Budget 2025 does not meet the moment. It raises the deficit, it raises the debt, it raises inflation, it raises the cost of living on every household in the country, it ignores warnings and it leaves Canadians paying more and getting less. Canadians deserve better than this. They deserve leadership that respects their struggles, listens to their concerns and delivers real results. We will continue to fight for accountability, and we will continue to fight for affordability.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, here is a flashback. When Stephen Harper became the prime minister, he inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus and turned it into a multi-billion dollar deficit in virtually one year. That is the reality. The highest deficit, when we factor in inflation, was when the leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Conservative caucus with Stephen Harper.

Instead of trying to look at issues within the budget, would the member at the very least concede that the number one issue coming out of the last election was the opportunity for Canada to look beyond the United States on trade and enhance trade opportunities? That is exactly what the Prime Minister has done. We can talk about England, Asia, the Philippines, Korea, Indonesia and so many others. Does the member support those initiatives?

● (1735)

**Dan Muys:** Mr. Speaker, let me correct the record. The budget was balanced in 2015. We were the strongest-performing economy in the G7 and in the OECD at that time, and we were increasing health care transfers to the provinces year over year.

*Government Orders*

Let me answer the question. I talked about this quite a bit during the election. Canada has everything the world wants. Canada has everything the U.S. wants. We have oil, gas, forests, expertise and smart people. The second-largest nuclear plant in the world is just down the highway from where I live. We have people working in that supply chain. We also have potash and uranium.

It has been eight months since the Prime Minister formed government, and in that time, what has been accomplished? There has been a lot of travel and a lot of talk, but no shovels in the ground. When former prime minister Trudeau said no to Germany when it wanted liquefied natural gas from us, Germany went to Qatar and built an import facility in 190 days. That is longer than the Prime Minister has been office, and—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Edmonton West.

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I could just lean over and ask this of the member, but I want him to put it on the record. He talked about the high interest payments caused by the Liberal deficit. Last year, the government increased interest payments by 13%, yet at the same time, it only increased health care transfers by 4.5%.

Could the member reflect on government policies? They focus more on paying interest and cost us massive interest payments instead devoting money to health care.

**Dan Muys:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Edmonton for that excellent point. We are spending more on the interest on the debt than we are on health care. That makes no sense. That was not the case 10 years ago when health care transfers were increasing year after year and we were the best-performing economy in the G7.

Having recently spent some time in a hospital, a couple of days on a stretcher in a hallway, I can say that a lot needs to be done in the health care system. Money is being spent because the Liberals cannot rein in the billions of dollars going to their consultant friends. They cannot produce a fiscally responsible budget. It should be going to health care, and it is a shame that it is not.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to nuclear energy. One of the new major project is about the advancement of nuclear energy. We have a Prime Minister who in the last number of months has brought together industry, provinces and territories, all for the advancement of major projects that are going to create opportunities for Canadians in every region.

Will the member at the very least support the major projects the Prime Minister and others have initiated and put on the books to move forward with?

**Dan Muys:** Mr. Speaker, I sit on the transport and infrastructure committee. We worked with the government on the amendments to Bill C-5 to get it passed, and we made it better. It was a tiny, baby step forward. Of course, we want to see these projects get done, but right now, there are a lot of announcements, a lot of paper, a lot of press releases and a lot of flash, but no projects on the ground.

By the way, the nuclear project on the first list was already being supported by the Government of Ontario. It was not new in any

way. It was just more paper, announcements and optics from the Liberal government.

**Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to lend my voice in support of Bill C-15, the budget 2025 implementation act.

Our new government has been focused on bringing down costs and creating new opportunities for Canadians. We have cut taxes for 22 million middle-class Canadians, saving two-income families up to \$840 per year. Through budget 2025, we are creating opportunities for young Canadians to transition into the workforce and launch successful careers by launching a youth climate corps and providing 175,000 placements through Canada summer jobs, the horizontal youth employment and skills strategy, and the student work placement program in 2026-27.

Bill C-15 is another important milestone in delivering measures to make life more affordable for Canadians. The bill recognizes that Canadians are concerned about affordability. Paying for essentials depends on having the funds to pay the bills, but also on the timing of when we receive those funds. We know, for example, that digitalization in the financial sector has brought many benefits for consumers, including the immediate transfer of funds. However, at the same time, we know that consumers who remain reliant on legacy financial products and services, including cheques, 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 funds from \$100 to \$150; remove the timing distinction between funds deposited in person or via other means; make regulations to reduce the number of days banks may hold deposited cheque funds; raise the current value threshold of \$1,500, below which shorter cheque hold periods apply; and apply the changes to trust and loan companies. Once again, Bill C-15 would make this change a reality.

However, that is not the only way the bill would help improve financial services to help Canadians manage their money. Consumer-driven banking, also known as open banking, refers to a secure framework that lets Canadian individuals and businesses share their financial data with the approved service providers of their choice. This framework would give consumers greater control over their data while promoting a competitive and innovative financial sector that strengthens Canada's position in the global digital economy.

### *Government Orders*

In short, 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 these policy goals by empowering consumers, enhancing data accessibility and supporting new financial service providers and business models.

At the same time, we know that the absence of such 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 that may be left without recourse if something goes wrong. Our consumer-driven banking framework would address these risks by using application programming interfaces, or APIs, to provide more secure communications between entities.

Giving Canadians greater control over their financial data opens the door to financial products and greater choice between providers, fostering a more dynamic financial sector and productive economy. Unlocking these new opportunities would lead to improved financial decision-making, lower costs and more tailored products and services for consumers. Bill C-15 would be fundamental in 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 by 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.

● (1740)

All Canadians would be expected to benefit from the consumer-driven banking framework as 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 financial decisions and better management and mitigation of financial stressors. For businesses, it could mean improved access to new forms of financing and reduced administrative burden from better integration and automation of key functions, but lower-income and financially stressed households are expected to benefit the most through access to lower-cost products, clearer choices, and tools to manage debt and reduce financial stress.

What is more is that this is not the only way that Bill C-15 would help Canadian financial consumers save and manage their money. We know, for example, that all Canadians would benefit from improvements to the federal credit union framework, since allowing more financial institutions like credit unions to grow would create more competition in the financial sector. Competition drives down fees, improves interest rates on deposits and leads to better customer services, bringing benefits to the diverse regions across Canada that credit unions currently serve. Competition in the sector could also drive efficiency and support economic development and productivity as financial institutions are driven to allocate capital to their most productive uses.

That is why budget 2025 proposes to amend the Bank Act, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act and the Financial Con-

sumer Agency of Canada Act to support federal credit unions' growth via amalgamation or asset acquisitions, and to make it easier for credit unions to enter the federal framework, including by providing the flexibility for them to continue their existing auto-leasing business on a permanent basis. With these changes included in Bill C-15, we have yet another way it would bring down costs for Canadians and yet another reason to support the bill.

The bill also includes provisions that would exempt the Canada disability benefit from being treated as income under the Income Tax Act, helping ensure that Canada disability benefit recipients would keep the full value of their benefits, including other federal income-tested benefits and programs, such as the Canada child benefit. Helping to reduce poverty and increase the financial well-being of low-income persons with disabilities is a key priority in our government's work to build a fairer Canada, and it is yet another reason for parliamentarians to lend their support to Bill C-15.

However, it does not stop there. The bill even includes new financial support for those who provide help to those who need help. Personal support workers help Canadians live and age with dignity, and they helped us to get through the COVID-19 pandemic. We as a country owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude. That is why we would introduce a temporary personal support workers tax credit, under which eligible personal support workers employed in the provinces and territories that are not already covered by a bilateral agreement with the federal government, to increase wages for personal support workers. They could claim a refundable tax credit equal to 5% of their eligible earnings, providing support of up to \$1,100 per year.

● (1745)

This measure to support frontline health care workers would be available for the 2026 to 2030 taxation years and is estimated to cost \$1.48 billion over six years, starting in 2025-26. Of this amount, \$1.17 billion would be sourced from funding previously committed, but unutilized, to support wage increases for personal support workers. The bottom line is that this tax credit would empower the personal support workers who care for us by putting more of their hard-earned money back in their pockets.

That is what this bill is all about. Our government remains focused on empowering Canadians by lowering costs, increasing competition and expanding opportunities—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Riding Mountain.

*Government Orders*

• (1750)

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was in British Columbia last week, where I found a vending machine full of drug supplies such as foil and crack pipes. Anyone could access these drug supplies, because they were free and accessible. Does the member believe we should be funding vending machines full of crack pipes, or that we should be funding treatment that gets addicts off this poison that is killing them?

**Bruce Fanjoy:** Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting question. I absolutely do not believe we should be funding vending machines—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order, please. Let us keep the crosstalk down.

The hon. member for Carleton.

**Bruce Fanjoy:** Mr. Speaker, we believe in evidence-based solutions for addressing the most complicated problems Canadians face.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during the last election, I am sure the member for Carleton heard at the doors, as I did, a great deal of genuine concern about the Canada-U.S.A. agreement. We talked about two things during the election and coming out of the election. One is that we need to be able to expand our trading opportunities beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border, and the second is that, especially after the election, we would have to be patient and make sure we get the best deal between Canada, the United States and Mexico. We should not have to feel rushed to do it; rather, we should put in the time to make sure we get the best deal for Canadians.

Can the member provide his thoughts on the importance of trade, in particular on expanding trade beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border?

**Bruce Fanjoy:** Mr. Speaker, it was discussed earlier, and my Conservative colleagues have made a big deal about the Prime Minister's not dropping everything and talking to the United States. The Prime Minister is sending a message every day when he is talking to other reliable partners across the world. We are showing the American administration that we are prepared to deal with countries that will work with us in good faith, be reliable partners and provide markets for our goods. The Prime Minister will speak with the administration in due time, when those constructive—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Prince Albert.

**Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, division 2, the Canada Post Act; division 8, the Farm Credit Canada Act; division 18, the Special Economic Measures Act; and division 24, the Broadcasting Act, are examples of things included in the budget implementation act that have nothing to do with the budget.

Does the member believe, understand or concur that the Liberals are actually shoving things in the budget with disrespect to Parliament, such as the First Nations Goods and Services Tax Act, that actually deserve their own piece of legislation and their own committee time so Parliament can actually put forward a proper bill about them, instead of the Liberals' shoving them in for a 30-second bite in the budget implementation act?

**Bruce Fanjoy:** Mr. Speaker, budgets are by their very nature broad in scope. They include everything the government is committing to. I am sorry if there are things in bill that the member would like to have as stand-alone legislation, but I do not think this is a matter I am disappointed in.

**Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the member has been paying attention to television and all the reported crimes, including financial crimes, especially of seniors being cheated out of money. With the bill, will the government protect seniors and others who are subject to financial crime and fraud?

**Bruce Fanjoy:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has previously announced that the Government of Canada is taking strong measures to protect seniors and other vulnerable Canadians from financial crimes.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a privilege to rise in the House of Commons and speak on behalf of the great people of southwest and west-central Saskatchewan. It was a nice weekend back home, but it looks as though, this week, winter is going to be settling in for the long haul. Unfortunately, there is some snow on the forecast, so I just want to wish everyone well back home as we get ready for winter to settle in.

I want to start by saying what the national debt was during question period. It was \$1,281,213,600,467. I am ballparking those last six figures because the debt clock moves really fast, and I cannot even see what the numbers are because it is reeling at such a great speed. Since then, the national debt has increased by over \$15 million on just the interest that has accrued. Right now, we are sitting at \$1,281,228,741,000, now 42,000, now 43,000. Again, I cannot even read the hundreds column because it is going way too fast.

I wanted to bring that up for people so that they can understand what we are talking about when we say that the government needs to exercise fiscal constraint and that it needs to be responsible with the budget. What does it mean when those numbers go high? When government spends way more money than it brings in, that leads to inflation in what people pay for goods. When we talk about many of the issues we face as a country, particularly the next generation of youngsters, the government sets the tone with its own finances. Youngsters are looking to figure out how they are going to build a home and how they will afford groceries or go to university, things like that. The current budget is a terrible example for the next generation of how to set a budget, follow a budget and stick to a goal in terms of what one is going to do.

*Government Orders*

The Prime Minister said that he was never going to go higher than Justin Trudeau's debt number. That was \$42.2 billion. We are at \$78.3 billion. In fact, the member of Parliament for University—Rosedale was the finance minister. She actually resigned her position because of what Justin Trudeau was doing with the budget, which precipitated the whole process through which the current Prime Minister became the leader of the Liberal Party and, therefore, the Prime Minister of Canada.

Why does all this matter? I was comparing the budget to the 2024 budget, which had “fairness for every generation”. The projections the Liberals had for the 2024 budget and in relation to the fall economic statement were that the projected deficit for this fiscal year was going to be only \$38.9 billion. When we look at the budget, right now, we are sitting at \$78.3 billion, so there is a discrepancy of almost \$40 billion.

The Liberals are probably going to get up, and someone is going to say that it is Donald Trump's fault and so on and so forth. There is a bit of blame that can maybe go there, but there is another promise that was broken. The Prime Minister said that he was the man who was fit to deal with a crisis and that he knew how to manage a crisis. As we saw in the media today, “whatever, so what?” was his whole response to how things have been going with Donald Trump.

We know that the Prime Minister has been a failure on trade and with the current budget. Something else that caught my attention, and I do not think that it caught the attention of too many other people, is that the debt ceiling for Canada was also increased. It has actually increased three times in the last four years. Most people do not know that. It is another small fact that slides on through without anybody really talking about it. Let us compare and contrast that with how things go in the United States: If the government has to increase the debt ceiling, it is a big process that gets national attention and makes the news. It even makes it on to CBC, which is supposed to be the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but it spends more time covering American than Canadian politics.

Anyway, the debt ceiling has increased three times in the last four years. It has been increased to somewhere around \$2.3 trillion. It makes one wonder what the government's plan and projection is going forward if it is already increasing the debt ceiling that high above what the current debt already is.

• (1755)

Going forward, let us go out the next four or five years, because the budget actually does that. It forecasts what the year-over-year deficit is going to be, and it also projects what the cost to service the debt is going to be. It is going to cost about \$76 billion to \$78 billion just to pay the interest on the national debt three or four years from now.

Why is that significant? I am going to give people back home a specific example. Everybody in Saskatchewan remembers when, in the 1990s, the federal government's debt got out of control. Jean Chrétien tried to borrow more money and was told that he could not. He ended up rolling back health care transfers to the Province of Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan, 52 hospitals that had eight beds or less were closed or were repurposed and had their service delivery changed. That was the impact that this had all across

Saskatchewan. I am sure other provinces went through the same thing.

In Saskatchewan, that was devastating. Our health care services have now become so heavily centralized. In some cases we have to drive three or four hours just to be able to see a doctor, when there used to be a hospital or a health clinic only half an hour or even 20 minutes down the road. That is no longer the case. For example, someone living on a farm or in a rural community who wants to start a young family has to go two hours to get to the hospital to be able to deliver their child.

Things like that have had a dramatic impact and have been a change over the years. With the Liberal government's budget running such a massive deficit, people in Saskatchewan always remember what the ripple effect of that was and how it happened.

Pierre Elliott Trudeau had done exactly what Justin Trudeau did. Interest rates were low, so they locked in crazy spending. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, in the 1970s, ran a deficit of an equivalent of, I think, \$72 billion when we factor in the value of today's dollars. The way that the borrowing happened at that point in time, when that all came to be renewed in the late 1980s and into the 1990s, interest rate percentages were in the high teens and into the 20s. There is a reason why the government could no longer borrow more money.

That was why, when Jean Chrétien tried to borrow more money and he could not, he had to massively slash government spending, which meant that he slashed the transfers to the provinces. That is what took one of the biggest hits.

That is the track record of out-of-control Liberal spending. Canadians do not want those results again.

Let us talk about the fiscal anchors. The fiscal anchors from the previous budget have all been completely abandoned. Those included not spending over \$42 billion, and also making sure that the debt-to-GDP ratio did not go over a certain level. We have blown way past that level. The government has now switched to a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio and also to the balancing of the operating budget. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, the independent PBO, did a fantastic study. He said that there is only a 7.5% chance that the deficit-to-GDP ratio will decline. There is a 92.5% chance that the government is going to fail on that fiscal anchor as well.

Let us talk about a few other things. There are a couple of things the government has said that we will give it credit for. It wanted to repeal the carbon tax. The Conservatives opposed the tax for a very long time, and the Liberals repealed it. We opposed the emissions cap, which they are repealing because, they cited, it would have marginal value on actually accomplishing any emissions reduction. We all know that it was actually a production cap all along.

There is a section in the budget that I was looking at earlier, called “Improving the Efficiency of the Tax System”. It does not even get half a page. All it does is remove the luxury tax from airplanes and yachts. It also repeals the underused housing tax. That is it for improving the tax system.

*Government Orders*

During tax season, so many people came in to talk about their issues with CRA, how the tax system was unfair and how it needed to be massively overhauled and reformed. The government could have chosen to, for example, change how the livestock tax deferral works for our ranchers when they go through drought. It would have had a massive impact if that livestock tax deferral were to have been extended. That would have been a positive measure and a step in the right direction, but no.

The gun buyback program is in the budget: \$742 million to take property away from law-abiding Canadians. That is shameful.

• (1800)

They are spending \$362 million on farmers overseas, not on farmers here in Canada or in Saskatchewan. With the trade issues that we are seeing going on, I can think of lots of great places where that money could have been used instead.

Maybe in questions, we will get to that.

• (1805)

**Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's drawing such focused attention to the fiscal disaster that the previous Progressive Conservative government left to the Liberals in the 1990s, which necessitated the very challenging fiscal decisions that were made at that time. That is clear; that is the historical record, and the member seems well aware of that challenge.

In the context of our colleagues' concerns about the level of federal spending over the last couple of years, I would encourage them to be a bit more specific in terms of what they would have chosen not to spend on. Would it be the Canada child benefit that the Conservative Party would not have supported and not have spent money on? Would it be \$10-a-day child care? Would it be the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion? Would it be national defence spending such that Canada would meet its 2% NATO target? Would it be CERB, which rescued Canadians from the effect of the pandemic, or the other pandemic supports that the government provided?

What would you not have spent?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Members should address questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley.

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite publicly supported defunding the police. I did not hear him say that.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about ways that we can save money, for example, Conservatives proposed that we would cut funding to the CBC. That is a pretty simple and easy one there. There is the \$742-million gun buyback program, which I mentioned already. The \$10-a-day child care system is not working the way the Liberals said it would work. There have been day care closures. There have been all kinds of issues with that. Access to day care has not actually increased at all.

I could go on and on. The private sector was going to build the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. The Liberals should have let the private sector build it. Instead, they meddled with it and messed

up the process. They should fix the process and let the private sector build things.

**Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the thing that is probably most disappointing in the budget is the lack of help for our young adults, the adults who cannot afford a home, who are full of fear and anxiety. Quite frankly, they now have a belief system that nine out of 10 young adults will never be able to afford a home. We need to get rid of that belief system.

I know my hon. colleague has an up-and-coming family as well. What should have been in the budget, such as removing the industrial carbon tax, to help our young Canadians to be able to afford a home and to start a family?

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, that was a fantastic question. There are several things they could have taken out of the budget that would have helped the next generation.

The industrial carbon tax is a huge one. It is largely a hidden tax. We cannot see it on line items, but it is baked into a lot of things. Any of the large emitters that have it include the steel producers. The Prime Minister, when he was running to be the leader of the Liberal Party, asked, who uses steel anymore anyway? That shows how little he actually knows about how buildings are built and how large projects are built in this country. There are many such things that could have been done differently and should have been done differently. The industrial carbon tax is one great example.

As another example, there is no software lumber agreement. Ever since the government has been in power, for over 10 years now, we have not had a softwood lumber agreement with the United States. We need lumber to build homes. We have had 30 sawmill closures in B.C. alone, yet there has been no acknowledgement from the government about that.

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we just heard at COP30 that Canada got awarded the fossil award. Here we have, right now, Liberals who are competing with Conservatives on who can out-pipeline the other.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Gord Johns:** The Conservatives are saying they won. Mr. Speaker, they want to keep the fossil award, year after year. I do not doubt that they are going to get it, the way things are going.

There is a proposal that is going to be talked about later in the week. The Prime Minister is meeting in private with Danielle Smith, the Premier of Alberta. He is not consulting with the Province of British Columbia, nor is he consulting with first nations, about lifting the tanker ban that has been in place for over 50 years.

Would my colleague think it appropriate if this were to happen in his home province, that there was a proposal such as for a pipeline, but neither his premier nor the first nations in his home riding were consulted?

*Government Orders*

● (1810)

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, what I will say to the member opposite is that he was sort of getting on the right track because I think the point he was trying to make was that natural resource development is the jurisdiction of the province. It is not the federal government's jurisdiction to be in natural resource development.

When I look at the Major Project Office, most of the projects it is developing are projects that are under provincial jurisdiction and should be left alone to the provinces. Instead, the federal government wants to maintain a hammer over the provinces and be the one to try to cherry-pick what projects can and cannot be built, when it should not be meddling in provincial governments' or first nations' jurisdiction to begin with.

**Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the good people of Milton East—Halton Hills South to bring reflections on our government's 2025 budget and Bill C-15, the budget implementation act. This is a budget that lays the blueprint to address a new paradigm of economic development, nation-building and generational investment. This is a budget that believes in Canada. This budget is historic, and it comes at a historic time, but is also a time of challenges.

We know that Canada is grappling with recent economic hardships as a result of the unfair tariffs the United States has thrust upon us. These tariffs have contributed to a global disruption of economic conventions and to unaffordability around the world. It is not just a Canadian problem. In fact, we saw recently that unaffordability in the United States is so critical that the American President has actually reversed course on his prized tariff policy, reversing tariffs on food items that Americans were struggling to afford, and they still do.

However, Canadians know that times of challenge are also times of opportunity. Now is the time for us to re-evaluate and recommit to our own destiny. We do not need to rely on anyone to be prosperous. We have much of what we need right here: an educated, hard-working and patriotic population; vast natural resources that the world wants; and a philosophy of co-operation, quality and responsibility that makes us a desired partner for trade, investment and collaboration the world over.

The broad shifting tides of the global economic landscape are being felt in the daily lives of Canadians. As a government, it is our duty to address this. Our 2025 budget is the foundation of our answer to this challenge. Here, in the people's House, we all hear it and feel it. Affordability, housing, employment, our young people, crime and defence all need and deserve our collective attention.

It is the right of every Canadian to feel secure in their daily needs and endeavours. We understand the importance of investing in resources for a safer community, and that is why budget 2025 would invest \$1.7 billion over four years into public safety and border security by hiring 1,000 new RCMP officers and 1,000 new border security agents. Safety in our communities is also top of mind. By investing in law enforcement and justice reform, we would tackle organized crime, gun violence, auto theft and many other crimes. Safety is the first pillar of prosperity.

I have four young adult children. As a mother, their struggles are my struggles. Youth unemployment rates are not acceptable. Over the next two years, \$594 million will develop 100,000 summer jobs under our Canada summer jobs program. Investing over \$300 million over two years in our youth employment and skills strategy would provide employment and support to 20,000 young people facing employment barriers, and we would create 55,000 work-integrated learning opportunities for post-secondary students by investing \$635 million in our student work placement program.

This new government has also committed \$40 million to create a youth climate corps that will provide paid skills training to young Canadians to quickly respond to environmental emergencies, support recovery and create a resilient Canada for generations to come.

Hand in hand with employment is the pride and accomplishment of a home to call one's own. We have been facing a steep housing supply gap. To combat this, our government has allotted \$13 billion over five years to our Build Canada Homes initiative, supercharging the housing industry and catalyzing private sector partnerships to build homes at a rate unseen since the postwar period. We would also expand transitional and supportive housing for the most vulnerable among us, working with our provinces, territories, municipalities and indigenous communities.

In the short term, we are providing relief by bringing down house purchase costs through our elimination of the GST for first-time homebuyers, allowing them to recover up to \$50,000 of the GST paid toward a new home, money that would go directly back into their pockets. We are also protecting existing affordable housing through launching the \$1.5-billion Canada rental protection fund under Build Canada Homes to ensure that affordable rent is not being lost to increases.

To provide quick relief to nearly 22 million Canadians, our government has implemented a middle-class tax cut aimed to specifically target Canadians in the lower and middle tax brackets. In hand with this, our government is transitioning to automated federal benefits for Canadians through simplifying the filing of tax returns. This would result in approximately five and a half million Canadians receiving the benefits they are entitled to but are not currently collecting simply because they are not filing tax returns. These benefits belong to the people, and our government is removing obstacles so the people can benefit.

Canadians are not afraid of hard work, and the government is implementing a new re-skilling package for workers. By providing \$570 million, we would support training and employment assistance to workers who have been affected by tariffs and global market shifts.

*Government Orders*

Guaranteed in our charter is security of the person, and this is a foundational tenet in Canada's health care system, a system that is envied the world over and that every Canadian can look to with pride. The government would invest \$5 billion over three years to our dedicated health infrastructure fund. We recognize that hospitals, urgent care centres, emergency rooms and medical schools need to be at the forefront of our investment to serve Canadians.

• (1815)

In my riding of Milton East—Halton Hills South, plans are under way for a new hospital in Georgetown and a palliative care hospice, each facing significant capital costs. Budget 2025's health infrastructure proposal is the type of plan that will support such projects. Our municipalities and our people need this support.

My history as a municipal councillor in Milton gives me an insightful perspective in this sphere. So much of our municipal planning depends on investing in core public infrastructure. Municipalities have limited ways to raise revenue and cannot run budget deficits, yet they are burdened with increasing responsibilities, typically without the corresponding financial support.

I am so proud to stand up for this budget, which commits \$54 billion to core public infrastructure over the next five years through our build communities strong fund. This infrastructure is imperative to supporting municipalities as they work to facilitate home-building in our communities.

Of course, with development, we must be mindful of our impact on our natural environment. Our budget outlines the path to supporting a green future while providing prosperity by becoming an energy superpower in both clean and conventional energy. Lowering our emissions is a necessity to protect the competitiveness of our oil, gas and steel sectors. By placing emission reduction first, we are securing access to markets that prioritize sustainability.

The world economy is undergoing historical transformations in clean technology, and we are ready to lead. Canada's power sector has a clear emissions advantage compared to those of our peers, and we will capitalize on it. With this budget, we will build new infrastructure that places Canada as a clean energy superpower. This will include renewable energy projects, high-speed rail and investments in low-carbon fuels.

Budget 2025 strengthens industrial carbon pricing, supports critical mineral projects and boosts clean economy investments with tax credits. As we plant the seeds to invest in Canada, we will be doing it with a green thumb.

Our Prime Minister has been clear: Canada's new government will spend less so we can invest more. At a time when Canadians are facing economic pressures in their daily lives, this government recognizes its duties in solidarity with all Canadians. That is why this budget demands \$60 billion in savings, and we have done this while still protecting the vital services Canadians rely on: child care, dental care, pharmacare and our national school food program.

It is our duty to guard tax dollars and reduce inefficiencies. Our comprehensive expenditure review will focus on investments that meet program objectives, that complement, rather than duplicate,

services delivered by other levels of government and that cut red tape while creating efficiencies.

I am so proud to be a Canadian and a member of a government that is unafraid of taking bold action and meeting challenges head-on. It is at times of adversity that leadership is tested, and this government under this Prime Minister is leading this moment.

Canada is remarkably poised to lead through the shifting sands of global trade and embark on a new era of nation building. We are among the top producers of critical minerals and a world leader in artificial intelligence. We have unmatched market access as the only country in the G7 with comprehensive free trade agreements with all other G7 members.

We have the people, the resources and the stability necessary to prosper, compete and lead in the new economy being shaped before us, and to contribute to its formation in a way that benefits Canadians. Our mission is clear: protect, build and invest. This moment is a time for reflection, for honesty and for taking our place as a nation of builders and innovators. This moment is a turning point for economic prosperity and nation building in Canada.

We are taking control of our own future. We will achieve this by capturing all the promise and potential of our great nation and ourselves. For everything, there is a time, and this is a time to believe in ourselves, to believe in Canada.

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the member of Parliament that represents the RCMP depot where all RCMP officers are trained.

One thing this budget does, as the member said she wanted to have an honest look at it, is it cuts \$98 million from the RCMP budget. How does she expect Canadians to feel safer on the streets when the Liberals are cutting \$98 million from the RCMP budget?

Also, they are asking the RCMP to train 1,000 more recruits by 2030, which will cost \$120 million. Where are they supposed to find that money when they have already cut the RCMP budget by \$98 million?

• (1820)

**Kristina Tesser Derksen:** Mr. Speaker, certainly, our government has plans to invest a great deal in public safety. It is something we all heard a lot about at the doors.

*Government Orders*

We are hiring 1,000 RCMP officers and 1,000 Canada Border Services agents. This will result in a stronger border.

This government is serious about supporting our law enforcement men and women, who are keeping us all safe. I hope the opposition will join us in that endeavour.

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about the new youth climate corps, and I am really happy to see the government do that, but the intention when the NDP advocated for the creation of the youth climate corps was not for young people to clean up catastrophic oil spills on the coast of British Columbia.

When Bill C-5 was brought forward, the government made a commitment. The Prime Minister said he would consult with first nations and the premiers of every province before deciding to move forward with proposed economic developments such as pipelines. As of right now, the Province of B.C. has not been consulted, while there are backdoor conversations happening with Premier Danielle Smith, and neither have coastal first nations.

Are the Liberals trying to out-compete the Conservatives when it comes to pipelines? They won the fossil fuel award at COP. What is my colleague going to do to reverse that trend?

**Kristina Tesser Derksen:** Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague's concerns about this. Our Prime Minister and our government have been extremely clear on this point. No project of this nature is going to move forward without the buy-in and informed consent of the indigenous communities and provinces that are impacted.

**Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague for her phenomenal reflection on this extraordinary budget.

I will ask her to elaborate a little more, given her deep experience as a municipal councillor, on the challenges we are seeing at other levels of government. What are some of the strengths you see in the proposed budget?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Let us ask questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Milton East—Halton Hills South.

**Kristina Tesser Derksen:** Mr. Speaker, my background as a municipal councillor has been extremely valuable in this role because I understand how the policies of other orders of government trickle down to municipalities and how they impact folks living in municipalities.

We were thrilled to see the investments made in community infrastructure, for example, for building stronger communities. This is so important, because communities and municipalities now find that they are being delegated more and more responsibility from provincial governments without the corresponding financial support. Even though we are incentivizing builders and developers to build homes in our communities, we are also ensuring that municipalities are being made whole through infrastructure support.

**Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the member opposite's speech, and she mentioned trade disruption as one of the reasons for this budget and for the generational debt binge the Liberal government is on.

On this side of the House, we certainly support efforts to diversify and strengthen Canada's trade, but of course our number one and most important trading relationship is the one we have with the United States. I wonder if the member will tell us if she thinks that relationship is the most important and whether she cares about that relationship. Does she have any burning questions she would like to ask the administration on that relationship?

**Kristina Tesser Derksen:** Mr. Speaker, that is a very timely question. Obviously, trade with what had traditionally been our largest trading partner and closest ally for over 100 years is extremely important.

Through no fault of our own, we have found that the United States has changed course and decided to become completely unreliable. As Canadians, we need to control what we can control. While we will keep the option open to continue negotiating on trade with the United States, we need to seek other reliable allies and partners in that field.

• (1825)

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, when Canadians opened the budget, they were shocked. They were shocked because the Prime Minister promised he would be different from Justin Trudeau. He promised fiscal responsibility. He promised to reduce spending. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio. However, it was all show.

Canadians now see the truth. Instead, the Prime Minister has delivered the largest deficit outside COVID, at a staggering \$78 billion, but there are some people celebrating. I could almost hear the bankers and bondholders clinking their champagne glasses, thrilled about higher inflation and interest rates that will put more money in their pockets. The global elites are grinning too, because the Prime Minister quietly removed the luxury tax on yachts and private jets. However, the middle class are the ones who were fooled. As the saying goes, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

As I read through the pages of the budget, I was struck by what was not there. There was not a single meaningful measure to confront the drug and addictions crisis devastating our communities. For a decade, the Liberals have normalized drug use. They have promoted the consumption of illegal drugs, such as crack cocaine, meth and fentanyl, under the guise of safe supply. There is nothing safe about fentanyl. There is nothing safe about enabling someone to slowly poison themselves to death, yet the Minister of Health continues to make drugs more accessible and treatment harder to find. If it sounds insane, that is because it is.

Let us look at the facts. The Liberals approved the decriminalization of hard drugs in British Columbia. The then associate health minister signed an exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act that legalized drug use across the province. What has this experiment produced? If the minister walked down East Hastings Street in Vancouver as I did this last month, she would see what happens when government enables drug use. It is not just crime and chaos; it is costing lives too.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Dan Mazier:** I cannot believe what I am hearing across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, but last year alone, over 2,200 British Columbians died from toxic drugs, which is more than six lives every single day. The Liberals could have used the budget to shut down the failed experiment, but, for some unknown reason, they did not; instead, they let it continue while Canadians keep dying.

However, it does not end in B.C. The Minister of Health is approving supervised drug consumption sites across the country, including next to day cares, schools and playgrounds. Parents should never have to walk their children past people smoking fentanyl in broad daylight. Children should never find used needles in their playgrounds. Health Canada's own data shows that the most used substance at these federally approved sites is fentanyl. Nearly every second visit consists of fentanyl use.

How is this safe? It is unbelievable that the Liberals actually consider this safe.

It is not just the Conservatives who are saying this, but law enforcement is sounding the alarm as well. In a letter sent to the Liberal government earlier this year, the chief of the Ottawa Police warned that a federally approved supervised drug site in downtown Ottawa has become the focal point of community safety concerns. He reported an escalation in open drug use, aggressive behaviour and public intoxication in the neighbourhood. This is right in the middle of a community.

I walked down those streets as well, and it is unbelievable, yet the Liberal government consistently turns a blind eye to this. Law enforcement warned that the impacts have become so serious that nearby child care centres have been shut down over safety concerns.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (1830)

[*English*]

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, first, I want to begin tonight by honouring the courageous teachers and students from the Nuxalk Nation in Bella Coola who put themselves directly in harm's way to protect school children during a terrifying grizzly bear attack. This act of heroism reminds us of the strength and resilience of coastal communities. Our hearts are with

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

the Nuxalk Nation and the people of Bella Coola at this difficult time.

I also offer deep gratitude to the Heiltsuk coastal guardians, who were first on the scene when a loaded commercial barge began taking on water off B.C.'s central coast, and who continued working relentlessly to prevent an environmental and economic catastrophe. This barge is loaded with containers that represent huge commercial value, and the efforts are saving businesses millions of dollars. Their dedication reflects a level of responsibility and vigilance the Liberal government should aspire to meet. Once again, the first nations on the west coast are demonstrating extraordinary leadership in safeguarding their lands, waters, economies and future generations. I urge the Liberal government to learn from their example and listen to it.

Today media reports suggest closed-door discussions about granting exceptions to the oil tanker moratorium and advancing a crude oil pipeline and tanker corridor through the Great Bear Rainforest and Sea are under way. According to the news, the federal government has gone directly to Alberta and Saskatchewan without speaking to British Columbia or the coastal first nations who have cared for these lands and waters since time immemorial.

If accurate, it means the government is attempting to alter protections for the coast without including the people most affected. If so, the government is creating unnecessary and irresponsible risk. British Columbia has been clear that it does not support weakening the safeguards coastal communities rely on today. The Prime Minister has said that he would not use Bill C-5 to override a provincial government, and those words must be honoured, not quietly set aside under a cloak of secrecy accompanied by media leaks.

The Great Bear Rainforest is no place for crude oil pipelines or tankers. It is Canada's last stronghold of wild Pacific salmon, home to ancient temperate rainforests found almost nowhere else and surrounded by some of the most productive marine waters on the planet. Rather than undermining it, Canada must uphold free, prior and informed consent, and stand with coastal first nations who are unequivocally defending this irreplaceable place.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

The economic impacts are equally significant. Coastal first nations have built a multi-billion dollar conservation-based economy that supports cultural tourism, sustainable fisheries, habitat restoration, renewable energy projects and long-term local employment. This is an economic model rooted in stewardship, not extraction. A crude oil tanker route threatens those existing sustainable jobs. Canada should strengthen this proven economic foundation, not destabilize it through closed negotiations driven by outside pressure.

After long-term consequences cannot be ignored, the global shift to renewable energy is accelerating. Canada cannot afford to be left behind by clinging to 20th century infrastructure. A new crude pipeline today is not a path to prosperity; it is a costly detour from the opportunities emerging in the clean energy transition. Canada must do better. Coastal first nations continue to lead with clarity, courage and unwavering commitment to their territories and to the well-being of all Canadians.

Instead of excluding indigenous governments, sidelining British Columbia and pursuing backroom deals with oil patch lobbyists, the Prime Minister must meet directly with first nations in a spirit of true partnership and transparency. They have been clear: a moratorium with exceptions is no moratorium at all, and the Great Bear Rainforest and Sea is not a sacrifice zone.

**Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Commons, located on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people, land that reminds us daily of our duty to honour indigenous rights and reconciliation.

We are committed to making Canada an energy superpower while protecting our environment, including the northern B.C. coast. It is important to clearly state that the federal government has not received a proposal to build the project the member has referenced, and it has not been referred to the Major Projects Office for consideration.

If, at any time, this pipeline or any similar project is to be considered, our government is committed to meaningful consultation with indigenous people. Upholding indigenous rights is non-negotiable. Our approach is rooted in partnership, respect and reconciliation.

It is clear that many projects before the Major Projects Office feature indigenous communities as key stakeholders and leaders with real ownership stakes. Take the Red Chris mine expansion in northwest British Columbia, for example. Working in close partnership with the Tahltan Nation, this project will extend the mine's lifespan by more than a decade and boost Canada's annual copper production by 15%. It will employ 1,500 workers during operations and up to 1,800 during construction.

We should be proud that when operational, this mine will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by over 70%. As part of the proposed northwest critical conservation corridor, this project illustrates how indigenous leadership, critical minerals development, clean power transmission and conservation can work hand in hand.

From Nunavut, the Iqaluit hydroelectric project stands out as Nunavut's first 100% Inuit-owned renewable energy developer. This 15- to 30-megawatt hydro facility will replace Iqaluit's depen-

dence on imported diesel, which is close to 15 million litres per year, producing roughly 130,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas.

The project is a powerful example of Inuit self-determination and economic growth, while making it easier to stabilize local electricity rates. I can assure the House that every significant decision in this project, and others like it, involves direct engagement with rights holders and affected groups, showing true indigenous-led leadership for clean energy and a sustainable future.

Another potential project of national interest I would like to mention is Canada Nickel's Crawford project. Based in the world's second-largest nickel reserve, this initiative will anchor Canada's leadership in green industry.

Agreements have been signed with the Mattagami, Matachewan and Flying Post first nations, ensuring not only early business and employment opportunities, but also firm commitments on contracting and long-term economic benefits for the communities. In a landmark partnership, the Taykwa Tagamou Nation is investing \$20 million in the project, securing a meaningful equity stake. This partnership demonstrates that indigenous participation is not just possible but essential to the project's long-term success.

On the northwest coast of British Columbia, within the modern treaty territory of the Nisga'a Nation, the Ksi Lisims LNG facility, partnered by the Nisga'a Nation, Western LNG and Rockies LNG, is designed to be among the world's lowest-emission LNG operations. Federally and provincially approved, it will bring thousands of skilled jobs and nearly \$30 billion in investment—

• (1835)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals might try to dismiss these concerns, but the facts are clear: Coastal first nations have repeatedly warned that any move to weaken the oil tanker moratorium puts communities, ecosystems and sustainable local economies at risk.

If the government is engaging in closed-door talks about crude oil tanker traffic through the Great Bear Rainforest and Great Bear Sea without British Columbia or affected first nations at the table, it is a failure of transparency and reconciliation. This is not about partisanship; it is about safety, respect and responsible governance.

The teachers in Bella Coola and the Heiltsuk guardians show what true leadership looks like: protecting people and the environment before disaster strikes. Ottawa should follow that example, uphold its commitments and meet directly with British Columbia and coastal first nations rather than trying to negotiate exceptions behind closed doors.

**Claude Guay:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member that there are plenty of examples. I have another one, the north coast transmission line, which has been referred to the Major Projects Office for further consideration, twinning existing transmission lines from Prince George to Terrace and up to Bob Quinn substation, enabling clean growth for critical minerals and LNG while also improving telecom and electricity access for remote northwestern B.C. communities. Once operational, it would create thousands of careers, generate substantial public revenue, help prevent up to three million tonnes of annual carbon emissions, and anchor a clean energy corridor for generations.

When it comes to projects of national importance, the government will always work with indigenous people to find the right way forward.

• (1840)

#### THE ECONOMY

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here this evening to maybe get a little bit better answer to a question I asked in October. I talked about the fact that 86,000 jobs were lost in October and that 1,000 jobs were lost in Calgary, and about how that actually leads to more households' being food-insecure.

Since that time, the Canadian food sentiment index report came out last week. It said that 80.6% of Canadians say food is their top expense pressure, that 28% of Canadians needed to use savings or borrow money to buy food and that 25.5% of Canadians are experiencing food insecurity. The average family of four will spend \$800 more on groceries this year than last year.

That is an indictment of the 10 years of failed Liberal policies we have had in this country. I have been in the House long enough to remember when the current Minister of Finance was minister of trade and announced that grocery prices would go down by Thanksgiving, but that was Thanksgiving 2023, and grocery prices have continued to increase.

Then the Liberals tried to make food prices a global phenomenon, saying that they were going up this fast everywhere. However, we have heard time after time that food price increases in Canada are outpacing those in the United States by 48%, so this is a made-in-Canada problem, and it started with the out-of-control and reckless spending by the Liberal government.

Meet the new guy, the same as the old guy. Justin Trudeau never met a tax dollar he did not want to spend, and the Prime Minister is blowing past even the deficits of Justin Trudeau. It would make him blush. It was actually so cold outside today that I saw Liberals with their hands in their own pockets. That almost never happens.

After 10 years of failed Liberal policies, and this is the data, food insecurity is increasing time and time again, and food lines at the food bank continue to grow; more people are using the food bank

#### *Adjournment Proceedings*

than ever before. The Liberal plan has failed miserably. My question, to whoever is going to answer on the other side, is this: When will the Liberals get it together, stop their out-of-control spending and get budgets under control so families can afford to put food on their own table?

**Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is attempting to spread disinformation about a so-called hidden carbon tax. Let me be clear: There is no carbon tax applied to groceries.

Industrial carbon pricing applies to the largest polluters in Canada, not to families or small businesses. These measures drive investment to reduce emissions and build the competitiveness of Canadian businesses. Importantly, independent studies from the Canadian Climate Institute show that pricing industrial pollution is one of the lowest-cost ways to cut emissions while having a minimal impact on families.

Canada's output-based pricing system gives companies flexibility. They can invest in cleaner processes, buy credits from innovators or develop new technologies to cut emissions. This approach reduces pollution at the lowest cost and encourages innovation, helping Canadian businesses grow and protect jobs.

On the issue of food prices, the federal fuel charge was removed on April 1 of this year, and farmers continue to receive relief under the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act. Independent analysis shows that inflationary pressures on groceries are being driven by global supply chain disruptions, the war in Ukraine and energy price volatility, not federal climate policies.

The clean fuel regulations, sometimes referred to as the hidden carbon tax, are designed to cut greenhouse gas pollution by up to 26 million tonnes by 2030. These regulations also support major Canadian projects that create jobs across the country, renewable diesel and hydrogen facilities in Alberta, renewable natural gas and green hydrogen projects in Ontario and Quebec, and clean fuel projects in Newfoundland and Labrador. These initiatives not only reduce pollution but also strengthen local economies and maintain high-skilled employment.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Repealing these measures, which the member opposite suggests, would put jobs at risk, increase pollution and isolate Canadian businesses from global markets. Climate action is economic action. The policies in place protect workers, support families and position Canada for long-term competitiveness. Canadians deserve solutions based on facts, not slogans.

• (1845)

**Warren Steinley:** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the parliamentary secretary can sit there and read a speech that was written for her by someone behind the curtain, but I did not say any of that stuff. Actually, my speech did not even mention the carbon tax. The unhealthy obsession over the carbon tax coming from that side is a bit weird.

I talked about out-of-control spending, food inflation and families finding it harder each and every year to make ends meet because there is much more month at the end of their paycheque, and it just does not go far enough, and how the Liberals could actually help families.

With respect to the Liberals' continued obsession over slogans and the carbon tax, we know that they were wrong, because they repealed the consumer carbon tax after they fought tooth and nail for eight years, saying that it was the best thing for the environment. They then flip-flopped just to get re-elected, because they realized how unpopular it was.

Now I know how regular Canadians feel. I sat here and talked about real problems, and the parliamentary secretary just read a speech and did not listen to a single word I said. It makes these adjournment debates almost as disappointing as question period.

**Annie Koutrakis:** Mr. Speaker, there is no carbon tax on groceries.

Industrial carbon pricing and the clean fuel regulations are targeted policies that reduce pollution while supporting Canadian jobs and investment. They give businesses flexibility to innovate, cut emissions efficiently and remain competitive. These measures create jobs in renewable energy, hydrogen and clean-fuel projects across the country while protecting the economy from the growing costs of climate change. Repealing these policies would harm employment, increase pollution and weaken Canada's economic standing. Canadians deserve fact-based solutions, and these measures are delivering just that.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad and proud to be here tonight, not just on behalf of the constituents of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound but also on behalf of all veterans across Canada and their families.

I asked a question a while back with respect to the Liberal government's policy. I will read the actual policy that my question was about, which said, "Veterans Affairs Canada is pleased to supply, upon request, two commemorative wreaths to members of Parliament who will be representing the Government of Canada at Remembrance Day ceremonies".

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. That was not this year's Liberal government policy; that was the Liberal government policy for October

2017. Therefore, needless to say, I was shocked that, after the Liberals backtracked and did the right thing back in 2017, in 2025, they basically brought back the same policy again. Therefore, I questioned the minister on October 3 and asked why, with many ridings having dozens of cenotaphs, the Liberals are telling Canadians and telling members of Parliament that the government will now pay for only two. The minister responded as such, and I am grateful for the response, to a point. She said:

Proposed changes for the Wreaths for Parliamentarians program were made with the understanding that MPs would work directly with the Royal Canadian Legion, with proceeds supporting their local branches. I am learning that the changes could be significantly disruptive to Remembrance Day.

I have instructed my department to revert to the previous format for this year.

I have been a member of the Royal Canadian Legion since 1993. I have 25 cenotaphs in my riding. I have never had a single Legion member ever approach me asking me to purchase a wreath through the Legion. In fact, Legion members come to me asking to get a wreath from the government in order to recognize the over 100,000 Canadians who have made the supreme sacrifice in service to this nation.

My question on this issue to the Liberal government is pretty straightforward: Does the Liberal government think that having Veterans Affairs Canada provide a wreath at every single cenotaph for the over 100,000 Canadians who have made the supreme sacrifice in service to Canada is too much to ask of the government?

As a follow-up question, considering that the Liberal policy of trying to limit the number of wreaths provided by VAC keeps being brought forward every few years, will the government confirm that it will not try to have this limiting policy ever again?

I am now going to go on to something else. I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs is very up to speed on stuff with this year's budget and the impact it would have on Veterans Affairs. Considering that the second-largest cut in this Liberal budget, of \$4.4 billion, is to Veterans Affairs Canada and that the government is claiming that spending less on cannabis will somehow result in these savings, but last year only spent \$245 million, how is the government going to do that?

People at the Royal Canadian Legion and veterans right across this country are confused. Even today, the Legion spokesperson just put out a press release that they are "hearing concerns and confusion... Without clear details and simple explanations, many Veterans are in the dark...about what it all means for their benefits".

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Could the parliamentary secretary please clarify the impact this would have on the backlog in disability benefit applications; cannabis access and research; calculation of long-term care costs, which is more about a lawsuit than actually taking care of our veterans; confusion over the index of pension calculations; and any legislative amendments that would have an impact on the RCMP?

• (1850)

**Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there was an awful lot packed into those four minutes. The question on notice was in connection with the wreath program. I am happy to shed some light on that. As much as time will allow, I will try to get into the half a dozen questions on the budget.

I want to thank the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound for bringing to the attention of the House and of veterans their service and sacrifice. It is also important to clarify an important commemorative program for the benefit of the hon. member and the House.

Veterans Affairs Canada began the wreaths for parliamentarians program in 1986. It provided one publicly funded wreath for each member of Parliament to lay at a Remembrance Day ceremony organized by the Royal Canadian Legion in their constituency. Made in Canada, the wreaths represent the government's commitment to publicly acknowledging our continuing debt to our veterans for their achievements and sacrifice in the fight for peace.

Each wreath is shipped to parliamentarians in its own protective box and can be ordered by October 24 to arrive in time for Remembrance Day, November 11, each year. Since its inception, the program has evolved. At first, each member of Parliament was issued one wreath. Additional wreaths could be ordered by parliamentarians participating in more than one ceremony. Over time, the program evolved in a way that led to inconsistencies in the number of wreaths provided.

After hearing the hon. member, I think it is obvious that those inconsistencies continue, because the practice in the office of the member of Parliament for Charlottetown has always been to gladly accept the two wreaths that are allocated by Veterans Affairs Canada and then to call the Legion and purchase any additional wreaths that are necessary. I am quite surprised to hear that there is an expectation that that is not the norm. Maybe what I am doing is different, but I know that is the standard in my part of the country.

To distribute wreaths more equitably across the regions, the program now supplies two wreaths to each MP. They can be used by parliamentarians or their delegates at any commemorative event during Veterans' Week, not only those organized by the Royal Canadian Legion. If a member of Parliament or senator needs more wreaths, all they need to do is ask Veterans Affairs Canada, which will procure as many wreaths as the parliamentarian needs. This can be, for example, for more events or to commemorate another veteran or a fallen Canadian Armed Forces member.

Far from forgetting Canada's brave veterans, the government is committed to honouring their memory in ceremonial events organized by Veterans Affairs, the Royal Canadian Legion or other organizations. Rather than limiting wreaths, the department actively

supports parliamentarians and others in laying as many wreaths as they need.

The member's question was whether this program is about to come to an end. What I can say is that the program will not come to an end in such a manner that we fail to live up to our obligation to honour the fallen, and it will not come to an end without full consultation and discussion with everyone involved, including parliamentarians.

Let me touch briefly on the half a dozen questions in connection with the budget.

The first one relates to the difference between accrual and cash accounting. The cannabis for veterans program represents a future obligation to veterans to continue to provide medical cannabis. A decision has been made to change the reimbursement rate from \$8.50 per gram to the market rate of six dollars. In making this change, there will be less money dispensed going forward. The net present value of the future reduction is reflected in the budget.

• (1855)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** I will just give a gentle reminder that the questions should relate to the original question asked. I understand there is some good nature here, but in theory, it should relate to the original question asked.

The member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

**Alex Ruff:** Mr. Speaker, the question very much related to Veterans Affairs Canada and the support for our veterans.

I want to acknowledge that the parliamentary secretary provided some greater clarity on the wreath program. I appreciate having that history. He did not really answer my two questions, so I am going to leave the final minute of speaking to them.

This is not about where the money is coming from. I will easily pay for all 25 wreaths that go to the 25 cenotaphs in my riding. I represent a big riding that has more than done its share of supplying veterans across the country.

Does the parliamentary secretary not think Veterans Affairs Canada can at least put one wreath at every cenotaph across Canada? Will he commit to the program staying open so that Veterans Affairs can provide as many wreaths as every MP needs across this country, regardless of whether it is inconsistent or different from riding to riding?

**Sean Casey:** Mr. Speaker, part of the mandate of Veterans Affairs is to honour and commemorate our veterans, not only on Remembrance Day, but also throughout the year, across the country and around the world.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

The wreaths for parliamentarians program distributes two wreaths to each member of Parliament for use in commemorative ceremonies on Remembrance Day. If anyone needs more than two, they simply need to contact Veterans Affairs Canada. It will then purchase the wreaths through the Royal Canadian Legion.

We encourage all Canadians to honour our veterans and to remember the service of the Canadian Armed Forces every day of the year.

**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.)

---





# CONTENTS

Monday, November 24, 2025

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Canada's International Development Assistance

Motion .....	3981
Lamoureux .....	3981
Lake .....	3982
Lemire .....	3983
Kusie .....	3985
Hoback .....	3986
Hussen .....	3987
(Motion agreed to) .....	3988
(Motion agreed to) .....	3988

### Sitting Suspended

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11:53 a.m.) ..	3988
---	------

### Sitting Resumed

(The House resumed at 12 p.m.) .....	3988
--------------------------------------	------

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1

Bill C-15. Second reading .....	3988
Hogan .....	3988
Muys .....	3990
Lemire .....	3990
Fisher .....	3990
Lantsman .....	3991
Lamoureux .....	3992
Lemire .....	3992
Dalton .....	3993
Ntumba .....	3993
McCauley .....	3993
Beaulieu .....	3994
Deschênes-Thériault .....	3994
Beaulieu .....	3994
Hoback .....	3994
Lamoureux .....	3996
Lemire .....	3996
Zimmer .....	3996
Chi .....	3997
Melillo .....	3998
Beaulieu .....	3998
Deschênes-Thériault .....	3998
Hoback .....	3998
Kramp-Neuman .....	3998
Lamoureux .....	4000
Lemire .....	4000
Zimmer .....	4000
Auguste .....	4001
McCauley .....	4002
Bonin .....	4002
Chi .....	4002
Gourde .....	4003

Ntumba .....	4003
Mantle .....	4003
Gourde .....	4003
Ntumba .....	4005
Beaulieu .....	4005
McCauley .....	4005
Deschênes-Thériault .....	4005
Dandurand .....	4005

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Gender-Based Violence

Gazan .....	4007
-------------	------

### Canadian Heritage

Earle .....	4007
-------------	------

### Charitable Giving in Barrie South—Innisfil

Brassard .....	4007
----------------	------

### Guelph Nobel Prize Winners

O'Rourke .....	4007
----------------	------

### Public Safety

Brock .....	4008
-------------	------

### André Genest

Watchorn .....	4008
----------------	------

### World Junior Hockey Championship

Bailey .....	4008
--------------	------

### 350th Anniversary of Guru Tegh Bahadur

Dhaliwal .....	4008
----------------	------

### Beekeeping

Viersen .....	4009
---------------	------

### Madeleine Poulin

Champoux .....	4009
----------------	------

### Gender-Based Violence

Chang .....	4009
-------------	------

### Cost of Food

Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake) .....	4009
---	------

### Donald Edmund Graves

Greaves .....	4009
---------------	------

### Ethics

Seeback .....	4010
---------------	------

### Jocelyne Bates and Lise Poissant

Ramsay .....	4010
--------------	------

### Canada-U.S. Trade Negotiations

Reynolds .....	4010
----------------	------

### Young People in Canada

Sawatzky .....	4010
----------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### International Trade

Poilievre .....	4011
MacKinnon .....	4011
Poilievre .....	4011
MacKinnon .....	4011
Poilievre .....	4011
MacKinnon .....	4011
Poilievre .....	4011
MacKinnon .....	4011
Poilievre .....	4012
LeBlanc .....	4012
Poilievre .....	4012
Champagne .....	4012

### Foreign Affairs

Blanchet .....	4012
Fortier .....	4012
Blanchet .....	4012
Fortier .....	4012
Blanchet .....	4013
Fortier .....	4013

### Automotive Industry

Khanna .....	4013
LeBlanc .....	4013
Khanna .....	4013
Hajdu .....	4013
Gill (Windsor West) .....	4013
Bardeesy .....	4013
Gill (Windsor West) .....	4013
Bardeesy .....	4014

### Forestry Industry

Doherty .....	4014
Hodgson .....	4014
Doherty .....	4014
Hodgson .....	4014
Bragdon .....	4014
LeBlanc .....	4014

### Ethics

Thériault .....	4014
MacKinnon .....	4014
Thériault .....	4015
MacKinnon .....	4015

### Steel and Aluminum Industry

Martel .....	4015
LeBlanc .....	4015
Martel .....	4015
Bardeesy .....	4015
Kuruc .....	4015
Hajdu .....	4015
Kuruc .....	4015
Zerucelli .....	4015
Steinley .....	4016
Bardeesy .....	4016

### International Trade

Lapointe (Sudbury) .....	4016
Sidhu (Brampton East) .....	4016

### The Economy

Goodridge .....	4016
Gainey .....	4016
Goodridge .....	4016
Church .....	4016

### Carbon Pricing

Cody .....	4017
MacKinnon .....	4017

### The Economy

Cody .....	4017
Dabrusin .....	4017
Rowe .....	4017
Thompson .....	4017

### Finance

McCauley .....	4017
Solomon .....	4018
McCauley .....	4018
Long .....	4018
Kelly .....	4018
Champagne .....	4018
Godin .....	4018
Lightbound .....	4018

### Transportation

Lavoie .....	4018
MacKinnon .....	4018

### Natural Resources

Lantsman .....	4019
Hodgson .....	4019
Lantsman .....	4019
Hodgson .....	4019

### Ethics

Seeback .....	4019
Bardeesy .....	4019

### The Economy

Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles) .....	4019
Champagne .....	4019

### Employment

Berthold .....	4019
Bardeesy .....	4020

### International Trade

May .....	4020
Sidhu (Brampton East) .....	4020

### Presence in Gallery

The Speaker .....	4020
-------------------	------

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Foreign Affairs

Sidhu (Brampton East) .....	4020
-----------------------------	------

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Lamoureux .....	4021
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Kayabaga .....	4021
Motion .....	4021
(Motion agreed to) .....	4021
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Malnutrition</b>	
Deschênes-Thériault .....	4021
<b>Climate Change</b>	
May .....	4021
<b>Brain Injury</b>	
Johns .....	4021
<b>National Building Code</b>	
Chagger .....	4021
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Return</b>	
Lamoureux .....	4022
<b>Request for Emergency Debate</b>	
<b>Genocide of Christians in Nigeria</b>	
Poillievre .....	4022
<b>Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Speaker .....	4022

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1</b>	
Bill C-15. Second reading .....	4022
Deschênes-Thériault .....	4022
Dandurand .....	4023
Dalton .....	4023
Lamoureux .....	4023
Khanna .....	4023
Rocheffort .....	4024
Patzer .....	4025
Fortin .....	4025
Housefather .....	4025
Patzer .....	4027
Thériault .....	4027
Rocheffort .....	4027
May .....	4027
Motz .....	4027
Lamoureux .....	4029
Garon .....	4029
Dalton .....	4030
Zahid .....	4030

Kram .....	4032
Fortin .....	4032
Rocheffort .....	4032
Mahal .....	4032
Lamoureux .....	4034
Thériault .....	4034
Muys .....	4034
Bains .....	4034
McCauley .....	4036
Lamoureux .....	4036
Garon .....	4036
Watchorn .....	4038
Dalton .....	4038
Fortin .....	4038
Sari .....	4039
Dalton .....	4040
Garon .....	4040
Joseph .....	4040
Muys .....	4041
Lamoureux .....	4042
McCauley .....	4043
Fanjoy .....	4043
Mazier .....	4045
Lamoureux .....	4045
Hoback .....	4045
Ma .....	4045
Patzer .....	4045
Greaves .....	4047
Lewis (Essex) .....	4047
Johns .....	4047
Tesser Derksen .....	4048
Steinley .....	4049
Johns .....	4050
Nguyen .....	4050
Mantle .....	4050
Mazier .....	4050

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Johns .....	4051
Guay .....	4052
<b>The Economy</b>	
Steinley .....	4053
Koutrakis .....	4053
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Ruff .....	4054
Casey .....	4055

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>