



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 062
Thursday, November 27, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 27, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)
[English]

PETITIONS

FALUN GONG

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions this morning.

The first petition is from a group of individuals who are asking the House of Commons to urge the Government of Canada to call for the end of persecution of the Falun Gong in China and to take strong measures to combat the Chinese Communist Party's transnational repression in Canada.

The petitioners ask that the Government of Canada publicly call on the Chinese regime to end its persecution of the Falun Gong in China and transnational repression abroad, continue to impose sanctions on and pursue accountability for the CCP officials and proxies responsible for these human rights violations, and take stronger measures to protect the Falun Gong community, which is targeted by foreign repression.

* * *

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is from a group of individuals who say that choosing medical assistance in dying because of a lack of available services or treatments is not a real choice. Allowing medical assistance in dying for those with disabilities or chronic illnesses who are not dying devalues their lives, tacitly endorsing the notion that life with disability is optional and, by extension, dispensable. Offering medical assistance in dying as a solution for disability or chronic illnesses reduces incentives to improve treatment and care for people with those conditions.

Canadians do not want an ableist health care system in which the lives of those with disabilities are seen as not worth living. Many disability advocates in Canada have expressed opposition to allow-

ing MAID for people with disabilities. Therefore, these citizens and residents of Canada call upon the government to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting medical assistance in dying for those whose prognosis for natural death is more than six months.

FALUN GONG

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I too rise and bring forward the voices of Canadians who call on the government to present stronger measures in response to the Chinese Communist Party's engaged campaign for 26 years against the Falun Gong. Falun Gong practitioners have endured severe human rights abuses, mass arbitrary detentions, torture, killings and organ harvesting.

These Canadians call on the Chinese regime to end its persecution of the Falun Gong in China and their repression abroad. They call on the government to impose sanctions and pursue accountability for CCP officials and their proxies who are responsible for these human rights violations and to take stronger measures to protect the Falun Gong community targeted by these foreign repressions.

AIR SERVICE TO INDIA

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise today to table a petition on behalf of my constituents to deal with an important issue. The relationship between Canada and India continues to grow, in terms of the number of people who want to travel back and forth between Canada and India.

The petitioners are calling upon Parliament to do what it can to encourage additional flights, more specifically, for the community of Winnipeg to have more direct flights from Winnipeg into Europe and even possibly into India, whether that encouragement be provided by the Winnipeg Airports Authority, the Government of Canada or any member of Parliament.

• (1005)

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions to present to the House today.

The first petition deals with the issue of youth unemployment. I want to thank the petitioners for taking the initiative to get this important issue of youth unemployment before the House.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners observe that youth unemployment is alarmingly high across Canada, leaving many young Canadians unable to secure stable, full-time employment despite their education, skills and ambition. They know that training and skills development programs have not kept pace with the realities of our labour market. The immigration policy has not been effectively aligned with labour market needs, limiting opportunities for young Canadians in their chosen fields. The rising cost of living makes it harder for young people to afford housing near available jobs and for businesses to attract and retain employees. Persistent youth unemployment weakens Canada's economy and social well-being.

Petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to present a clear plan to reduce youth unemployment, developed in consultation with young Canadians, employers and educators, and to report to Parliament on progress toward job creation, training alignment and youth labour market participation.

UKRAINE

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition that I would like to present to the House is in response to the ongoing illegal genocidal invasion of Ukraine by Russia and the Putin regime. The petitioners highlight a number of aspects of this invasion.

This petition was prepared a little while ago, so there have been further developments beyond what is in the petition, but the asks are very clear and very present, and they are extremely important. The petitioners ask that the House stand with the people of Ukraine in the threat facing Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. They want to see decisive action from the international community against the Putin regime. They want consistent sanctions against the regime without the kinds of loopholes that, sadly, we have seen from the government on titanium and other areas. They want to see efforts to boycott Russian oil and gas imports in Canada and Europe, to secure energy agreements with western partners, to increase the supply of military equipment and lethal defensive weapons to protect the territory and human rights of the people of Ukraine, and to provide urgent humanitarian assistance and vital assistance to refugees.

It is sad to see that conflict continuing, and we need to press on for a Ukrainian victory, which is important for their security and for our security.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I am tabling highlights concerns from the disability community about euthanasia, or medical assistance in dying. The petitioners raise concerns about how making euthanasia available to people with disabilities, the only group of people who can access medical assistance in dying when they are not dying, devalues their lives and negatively impacts their experiences in interacting with the health care system.

I know people in this community are deeply concerned about how those living with disabilities are regularly offered MAID by people in positions of authority when they are not seeking it, but seeking other kinds of health or other services. Disability advocates are magnifying and agreeing with concerns raised at the United Nations about Canada's non-compliance with its international commit-

ments on the rights of people with disabilities as a result of the current situation.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting medical assistance in dying for those whose prognosis for natural death is more than six months.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the final petition I am tabling today highlights challenges faced by Ukrainian refugees here in Canada who, overwhelmingly, are working, contributing to Canadian society and, as the war continues, face uncertainty around their status here. Petitioners from my province of Alberta are calling on the federal government to create a clear path to permanent residency for those who are here through the CUAET program, a specialized approach to take into account their particular needs.

• (1010)

WILDFIRE RESPONSE

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table what I hope is my final petition calling for a national aerial firefighting task force, which was included in the budget.

The petitioners call on the government to work in partnership with the private sector to retrofit a portion of Canada's retired Lockheed CC-130 Hercules fleet; turn them into large air tankers for use in wildfire suppression across Canada; deploy these aircraft as part of a strengthened national wildfire response capacity to be shared with provinces and territories and, where appropriate, available for international humanitarian and emergency response missions; and prioritize this made-in-Canada solution, which leverages Canadian engineering and global expertise and delivers clear benefits for the public in protecting lives, communities and the environment.

This is from petitioners from Port Alberni in British Columbia.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed from November 26 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.

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C-15, the first budget implementation act. The budget was introduced after Canadians were made to wait well over a year to understand the fiscal reality the Liberal government put them in after 10 years.

Canadians are facing a harsh and worsening reality. When they open their wallets, they see less money and fewer opportunities. They are met with promises from a government that insists a few more billion dollars in Ottawa spending will magically resolve their struggles. The same government believes the same ideas are going to fix its messes: spend more, borrow more and add bureaucracy. Every time, it makes the situation worse.

I stand here representing the great people of Red Deer, Alberta, to tell the government my constituents have had enough. They have had enough of the 10 long Liberal years that continue to add inflationary spending to the already ballooned national debt left by Justin Trudeau.

Speaking of Justin Trudeau, as prime minister, he spent more of Canadians' hard-earned dollars than all other prime ministers in the history of Canada combined. Today, the current Prime Minister is well on his way to eclipsing the unfortunate milestone set by his predecessor.

Budget 2025 is not a blueprint for prosperity. It is a blueprint for more government intervention, more centralized planning and more top-down bureaucracy.

Just six months ago, the Prime Minister claimed he would restore discipline and fiscal credibility. Instead, the budget revealed a sharp departure from those commitments. What do Canadians have to show for it? They have a federal debt standing at nearly \$1.3 trillion; \$141 billion in new spending; a \$78.3-billion deficit in 2025-26 alone, which has ballooned from \$62 billion; an affordability crisis in which housing costs have doubled and food, fuel and necessities are out of reach for many; GDP stagnation to only 1% between 2014 and 2024; and a lower standard of living.

According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, the federal debt-to-GDP ratio in budget 2025 is projected to be higher compared to the 2024 FES and is no longer projected to be on a declining path over the medium term. The federal government's own so-called debt-to-GDP fiscal anchor has been abandoned. The government promised to help municipalities cut homebuilding taxes in half. The budget breaks that promise and locks in higher housing costs.

Meanwhile, Canada is mired in a productivity crisis of its own. Just days ago, the deputy governor of the Bank of Canada stated that we are stuck in a "vicious" cycle of "weak productivity."

He further stated:

Government Orders

A certain level of regulation is essential, of course. But it's fair to ask if we could regulate better. This could mean speeding up approval processes, re-evaluating the scope of some rules and reducing the overall uncertainty around regulation. We also need to address overlap, redundancies and contradictions between the different levels of government.

This is not some partisan Conservative attack. This is a government official in an institution tasked with setting the monetary policy of the government, which is something the Prime Minister should know well enough about.

Canadians expect economic stability, yet StatsCan shows the economy weakening rapidly. GDP grew by only 1.1% in the past year, for the second-lowest growth in the G7. Canada has lost more than 27,000 manufacturing jobs in the past year. Business insolvencies are up 35% year over year, which is the highest increase since the eighties. Wages are falling in real terms, with young workers experiencing the sharpest declines. Core inflation remains above 3%, and food inflation continues to rise month after month.

When parents in Red Deer wake up every morning, too often they are forced to wonder whether their paycheques will be enough to cover their rent or whether they will be able to put healthy, nutritious food on the table for their families. In March 2025 alone, there were 2.2 million visits to food banks across Canada, the highest number ever recorded.

● (1015)

In Alberta, 36% of food bank visits were for children. Even more troubling, employment income accounts for the largest share of income sources among food bank visitors, 31% of all visits. That means that fewer Albertans even have the means to donate to food banks to help their neighbours in need.

Let us talk housing. The government stole the dream of home ownership from an entire generation of young Canadians. Canadians were told that homes would be built at a scale and speed not seen in generations. What did the budget do? It created another bureaucratic organization and less action. The agency promised to immediately cut development charges in half. That has gone unfulfilled, and CMHC confirmed in October that housing starts are down 17%.

Government Orders

Young Canadians want to start a family and to be able to live the life they were promised after they were educated and have worked hard, but now they find it impossible to get ahead. This is the first generation in decades that has a lower standard of living than their parents and their grandparents did, and the government believes that bringing in more immigration will fix the problem. While Canadians are stuck without support to start and grow their own family, mass immigration into this country has played a major part in the affordability crisis, robbing Canadians of prosperity in their own country. It is simple: More people taking up more infrastructure, health care capacity, housing and government subsidies means less availability for Canadians already here.

It is not the fault of people coming to Canada under a false promise of a better life from a government without a plan for them. For decades, immigration with proper integration has shaped our communities and helped forge who we are as a nation. Indeed, it is the government's own doing of rapidly expanding our migration numbers without ensuring our institutions can handle it that has both collapsed Canadian confidence in our immigration system and led to the fracturing of communities across our country.

For example, over the past number of weeks, we have heard over and over again at the health committee that not one health care body was consulted on immigration levels to ensure that our health care system could handle them. If the people working to keep Canadians healthy do not even have a say on how many people they can treat, how can they be expected to care for millions more on top of their burden? Well, they were expected to, and the government said, "too bad".

Over 6.5 million Canadians are without a family doctor, and the nursing shortage is expected to exceed 100,000 nurses by 2030. Meanwhile, there are 80,000 foreign-trained health care professionals who came to this country to work in our health care system but are not able to do so. Again, government red tape and bureaucracy have made it impossible, but instead of integrating the health care professionals who are already here in Canada, the government wants to repeat the same mistake and bring in more. This is not sustainable.

All of this adds up, and somebody eventually has to pay the bill. It is simply unfair to pass on responsibility for today's reckless spending to our future generations while the government repeats the same mistakes of the past decade that led us to the problem. The government should be looking to unleash the power of Canadian ingenuity and industry; set the standards for growth; get out of the way; and incentivize the free market, not be the main driver of a centralized economy, or worse, make the conditions of a free market impossible to grow so that government is the only answer.

Canada has limitless potential if only the government would not see itself as the main character but as a supporting act to the Canadians who power it. Approve energy development, restore investor confidence, reform project approvals, expand our industries and get out of the way.

The people of Red Deer will not accept the irresponsibility of the budget. They demand and deserve better. They want action and real progress, not just the illusion of something happening, with more

talk and announcements. I will always stand here to be their voice against a government that has silenced them.

Conservatives will always fight for Canadian families and Canadian workers. I urge the government to start doing the same.

• (1020)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think it is important when we look at the beginning of the debate today to look at the contrast between the Conservatives and the government of the day. The government is headed by a Prime Minister who is committed to dealing with issues coming out of the last federal election, issues such as building one Canada, working with premiers, breaking down barriers and increasing trade among the provinces.

The Prime Minister and the government are committed to looking abroad in Indonesia, the Philippines, Korea, India and England. We have substantive legislation looking at ways in which we can expand our economy, create the jobs through the budget, invest in Canadians and invest in Canada. Let us compare that to the Conservative Party. All the Conservatives talk about is "cut, cut, cut" and the issue of deficit. By the way, our deficit is no worse than it was when Stephen Harper was the prime minister in 2009, considering the value of the dollar.

I am wondering if the member can provide his theory as to why he believes cuts are in the best interest of Canadians today.

Burton Bailey: Madam Speaker, the government loves to distract from the problems of its own making, but the reality is that the government got Canada into this economic situation. Conservatives have a plan to fix it, like cutting the industrial carbon tax, reversing Liberal inflationary deficits, fixing the broken immigration system and restoring order and peace to our streets. The Liberals should get out of the way and let us do it.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, once again, we share many of the Conservatives' concerns about this budget and its implementation. For example, my colleague mentioned the waste of money. If there is one clear and compelling example of money-wasting in this budget, however, it is no doubt the \$100 billion we are collectively leaving on the table only to fill the pockets of the oil and gas industry. That is the choice this government has made for an industry that posts record profits year after year.

Could there be a more glaring and shameful example of wasting taxpayer money?

Government Orders

[English]

Burton Bailey: Madam Speaker, for 10 years, members of the Liberal government stood up in the House and defended Justin Trudeau's policies tooth and nail. Now suddenly they want Canadians to memory-hole all the destructive decisions over the past decade that have made Canadian standards of living decrease, wages stagnate and housing be put out of reach, and they make every system in this country, from health care to immigration, crumble. At least they finally admit they did harm to this country. Now their actions need to follow.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's talking about how the health care system is overburdened and there is too much bureaucracy. The College of Family Physicians of Canada has cited that approximately 250,000 disability tax credit forms were processed in 2022. It estimates that this amounts to about 250,000 hours of physician time lost, and a million patient visits as well, just for physicians to fill out disability tax credit forms.

The budget amount is \$10 million to help people with up to \$150 each to do the form. Would it not just make sense for the government to recognize that if somebody qualifies as having a disability in their province or territory, they would automatically qualify for the disability tax credit? This would save taxpayers \$10 million and save a million visits for patients so doctors could actually be helping serve the Canadian public and taking the burden off our health care system.

Does my colleague agree that this is the kind of innovation we need right now and that we need to stop wasting doctors' time and taxpayers' money?

• (1025)

Burton Bailey: Madam Speaker, our health care system is so broken in Canada and needs so much reform. I sit on the Standing Committee on Health, and I hear every day about the waste. I am talking about the \$900 million that was spent on health care for our current overimmigration problem. I am talking about, in the current budget, \$5 billion that will be spent on hospitals, which will not even build one hospital. I am talking about the \$97 million the Liberals are going to spend that will not even get one extra specialist.

I feel that the whole system needs to be revamped. We as the federal government need to take the lead, look at the Canada Health Act and change and monitor the way we are giving money to the provinces.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Madam Speaker, budgets are not just about numbers; they are about trust. They are a promise, a promise that a government makes to its citizens: that it will be responsible with their money, transparent with their books and honest with their future.

When Canadians open their credit card bills, they do not see “operating” and “capital”. They do not get to move expenses around to a different column to make the numbers look better. When their fridge breaks or their mortgage payment rises, Canadians do not get a special carve-out or a subsidized tax shelter in Bermuda; they face reality, and all they ask is for their government to do the same.

When the Liberal Prime Minister announced that he would be splitting operating spending and capital spending in the federal budget, many economists, fiscal watchdogs and Canadians expressed deep worry, not because the idea was new but because it looked dangerous. It looked like an accounting trick used to hide deficits, confuse Canadians and bury the truth.

The parliamentary budget watchdog confirmed that this is exactly what is happening. The Liberal Prime Minister's new bait-and-switch definition of capital spending, according to his words, is “overly expansive” and “expands beyond the current treatment in the Public Accounts” and practice adopted by other countries.

Instead of following international standards, the Liberal Prime Minister quietly lumped in corporate tax breaks, subsidies, incentive programs and boutique handouts that would not be considered capital anywhere else in the developed world. He counted them anyway.

By using a proper, internationally accepted definition, the parliamentary budget watchdog found that real capital investment spending was 30% lower than what the Liberals claimed it was. That is a \$94-billion difference, a number hidden in the fine print. At the end of the day, every dollar the Liberal Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians through higher taxes, higher inflation and higher deficits. Canadians see it clearly. Canadians deserve an honest and affordable budget, not a manipulated and costly credit card Liberal budget.

A government that loses control of the numbers eventually loses control of the truth. First the Liberals had a fiscal anchor to keep federal debt-to-GDP on a declining track. They abandoned it. Then they created a new anchor, balancing only the so-called operating budget within five years. They abandoned that too. The Liberal Prime Minister has now moved this goalpost even further, maintaining a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. The parliamentary budget watchdog has already confirmed that there is only a 7.5% chance that this will actually happen. That means that there is a 92.5% chance that the government will not even meet its own target.

Government Orders

This is the same Liberal government that warned last year that keeping a stable debt-to-GDP ratio was key for fiscal responsibility, investor confidence and protecting Canada's AAA credit rating. Fitch Ratings, an independent credit ratings agency, has already issued a warning that the costly credit card budget and the Liberal accounting tricks underscore the erosion of the federal government's finances. When ratings agencies start to warn us, investors pay attention. The cost of borrowing gets more expensive, and the cost does not fall on the Liberal Prime Minister; it falls on working Canadians, families, homeowners, seniors and the next generation.

After spending months boasting that his fiscal anchor will lead to stability, the Liberal Prime Minister could not even pass his own test. He is proving that he is not trustworthy at all.

Behind every lofty speech and Liberal promise is one undeniable truth: that the numbers do not lie. Under the Liberal Prime Minister, the federal debt is growing by \$10 million every hour. That is how much he is costing Canadians. He will add \$321 billion to the national debt over the next five years, more than twice what Justin Trudeau would have added over the same period. Federal debt now stands at \$1.35 trillion, the highest in Canadian history, after the Liberal government doubled it over the last 10 years.

Next year taxpayers will spend \$55.5 billion in interest payments alone, more than what the government pays in federal health transfers and more than what it collects in GST revenue. That is \$3,300 per Canadian household, just to pay interest on old debt, not a single dollar to be used for hospitals, schools or infrastructure, let alone for repaying any of the debt the Liberals have accumulated.

Meanwhile, real GDP growth in 2025 is stalling at 1%, the second-lowest in the G7. Since January, Canada has suffered a \$62-billion net outflow of capital. It is not just people leaving; we are hemorrhaging investment, innovation, talent, factories and future employers. Investors are voting with their feet. They are losing confidence in Canada, and our productivity crisis and unemployment rate continue to worsen. Investors are warning us about the government's fiscal recklessness with their capital. We cannot build Canada strong when capital jobs and confidence are leaving faster than they arrive.

• (1030)

The Liberals told Canadians their new so-called expenditure review would save \$50 billion, but the parliamentary budget watchdog has his doubts. This so-called review lacks any detail regarding the impact on individual programs. It provides no information on how it would affect services, staffing outcomes or reporting. It has no accountability mechanism at all. In other words, it is not a real expenditure review; it is just a Liberal press release.

The costly Liberal budget will increase gross new spending by \$140 billion. Even if we take the \$50-billion claim at face value, the costly Liberal budget would still increase net new spending by \$90 billion. The math is simple. Even after using the Liberals' own inflated numbers, there are no savings, just bigger deficits, bigger debts and bigger burdens on Canadian families and the next generation.

The Liberal Prime Minister broke every single promise he made just eight months ago. He promised to keep the deficit at \$62 bil-

lion; it is at \$78 billion. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio; he is raising it. He promised to spend less; he is spending \$90 billion more, which is \$5,400 in extra inflationary spending per household. He promised more investment, but the costly Liberal budget even admits that private investment in Canada is collapsing and that productivity has worsened in the last 10 years. He promised transparency and then delayed the public accounts, in other words, the official audited financial statements of the Government of Canada, for months for the second year in a row.

He is not just breaking promises anymore; he is breaking Canada. It is no wonder the Liberal Prime Minister asked Canadians to make some sacrifices, as if Canadians have not sacrificed enough for Liberal failures. He wants to lower the expectations of Canadians and have us be content with less, because he simply is not delivering.

A government that conceals its books has already lost control of them. Canadians recognize that for what it is. Whether it is a cover-up or typical Liberal incompetence, only time will reveal which truth the Liberals are running away from.

While Canadians rushed to file their taxes, were squeezed by rising costs and were terrified of the CRA, one Canadian had no such worries. It was the Prime Minister, who is proving this to be the same old Liberal government with a new Liberal cover-up. While he was advising Trudeau to hike taxes on small businesses, tradespeople, doctors and families, his own Brookfield funds had their income stashed above a bike shop in Bermuda, a notorious tax haven with zero capital gains taxes, zero dividend taxes and zero withholding taxes. He was not just minimizing taxes; he was avoiding them entirely to the tune of \$5 billion or more.

Under the Liberal government, there is a two-tier tax code for Canadians. There is one for the rich Liberal friends of the Prime Minister and another for everyone else. Worse yet, in this costly Liberal budget, the Liberal Prime Minister gave himself and his buddies a tax break on the purchase of luxury yachts and private jets, while voting against scrapping taxes on food and groceries. The Liberal Prime Minister helped design a tax system he did not have to live under because he was living outside of it. While Brookfield was safely storing profits in Bermuda, small charities and family businesses faced the full force of the Liberal tax-collecting agency.

Government Orders

On top of egregious tax avoidance, the Liberal Prime Minister's conflict of interest cover-up is even worse. Brookfield's chief operating officer confirmed this month that 95% of its companies are not covered by the so-called ethics screen. That means 1,900 companies stand to benefit from government decisions that will enrich the Prime Minister personally at the expense of taxpayers, and Canadians will be kept in the dark about how those companies are involved.

The Liberal Prime Minister is even taking private meetings with Brookfield executives at the Prime Minister's Office and while he travels overseas. With ethics like this, how can Canadians trust him? He is starting to look a lot like the last Liberal prime minister, just more costly. At the end of the day, Canadians deserve a prime minister whose loyalty is to the public, not to his private portfolio or the shareholders of Brookfield.

Canadians feel betrayed. Do we continue down the path of manipulated budgets, rising debt, shrinking paycheques and declining prosperity, or do we rebuild a country where the numbers are honest, the budgets are responsible and the promise of Canada, that hard work leads to an affordable home, opportunity and security, is restored?

The Liberal Prime Minister promised Canadians he was a seasoned central banker who could be trusted to spend less and invest more, but it turns out he is just another Goldman Sachs investment banker who is in it for himself and the Brookfield shareholders. Canadians are left to pay the price this time.

Conservatives will expose the truth, restore fiscal discipline, demand transparency and protect taxpayers. We will rebuild a country where hard work leads to a home with a yard on a safe street and affordable and nutritious food on the family dinner table every day, and where the next generation is not sacrificing to survive, but thriving for a better tomorrow.

This is not just the Conservative way; it is the Canadian way, and it is the Canada we will fight to restore.

• (1035)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must say I find the way the Conservative Party continues with character assassination disgusting. The Prime Minister has done an absolutely outstanding job at protecting Canadian interests, travelling abroad and doing the things that are necessary here in Canada, and all the Conservatives want to do is attack his character.

I say shame on every one of them. It is absolutely disgusting to see an official opposition take the type of stand the Conservatives take, day in and day out, when we have a strong, powerful Canadian Prime Minister and a government that are committed to building Canada strong. Unlike the Conservatives, we will sidestep the character assassination. We will continue to work diligently at building Canada strong so that we will have the strongest economy in the G7.

How does the member opposite look in the mirror after saying such false information?

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, I find that rich coming from the member. We are not attacking the Prime Minister's character; we are attacking his record.

The member said we are spreading fake news. I am going to read directly from the costly Liberal budget so he cannot say we are spreading misinformation. On page 53 of this costly credit card budget, it states, "If Canada's productivity growth had matched the U.S. from 2017 to 2023, the median income of a family with one child would be nearly \$11,000 higher."

We would have been \$11,000 richer per year, per family and per Canadian household if the Liberal government had gotten out of the way.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I appreciated my colleague's speech. I think he did a good job. He tore apart the budget point by point in an extremely methodical and serious way. Listening to his speech, I felt that he was right on several points. Eventually, a question popped into my head: Why did the Conservative Party allow the budget to pass?

[*English*]

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, I am going to continue reading from page 53 of the Liberal costly credit card budget. It starts with "Over the past decade," and it is no coincidence that the government has been in power for exactly one decade. It reads:

Over the past decade, Canada's productivity performance has been persistently weak. In this time, productivity grew by only 0.3 per cent annually—less than one-third the pace of the previous two decades.... This had led to substantial productivity gaps with other G7 economies....

The Liberals like to compare Canada to the G7. It seems like we are doing the worst.

The Liberal member is going to accuse Conservatives of spreading misinformation. I read these words directly from this costly Liberal credit card budget, so he needs to check himself before he wrecks himself.

• (1040)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague broke out "check yourself before you wreck yourself."

I want to say how rich that was coming from our colleague from Winnipeg North, who never misses a chance to gaslight anybody who opposes any Liberal policy. He is a good Liberal soldier. Make no bones about it. Although we may differ on policy and suggestions, I respect that he is always here, every day, fighting for the other side. I do not always like it, but he does the job for the other side and he does it well.

Government Orders

The Liberals and the Prime Minister trumpeted this budget as generational, when all we see is generational debt. I wonder if we can give the member an extra 30 seconds or so to talk about how this budget, the lack of support and the debt are going to impact his riding.

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, I see almost nothing for Richmond Hill South in this budget. This is what I see. The cost of living remains high, putting financial pressures on families and small businesses. Unemployment has increased, driven by weak hiring and layoffs. Businesses face ongoing uncertainty, delaying investment and expansion. Productivity remains weak, limiting wage gains for workers. That is the current economic landscape.

By the way—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We have to resume debate.

The hon. member for Windsor West.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour and a pleasure to rise in this House on behalf of the good people of Windsor West.

They are not impressed with this budget implementation act. This is not just another budget for the people of Windsor. It took the government six full months to bring it forward after forming a minority government. It took six months, while families watched the price of milk go up. It took six months, while rent climbed and mortgages increased. It took six months, while the cost of everything, from basic necessities to kids' hockey, went through the roof.

When the budget implementation act finally arrived, folks looked at it and asked the same thing many of us are thinking here: Where is the help the government promised? That is the first of five questions I am putting before this chamber, not for theatre or to score points, but because people at home deserve straightforward answers.

First, where is the support families were promised after six months of waiting? Windsor is not a city of complainers. We do not expect perfection, but we expect fairness. We are a city that knows what work means, whether it is shift work, working on a line or driving a rig across the border. Our people do not sit still. They do not wait for someone else to fix their problems. They get up and get on with it.

However, they cannot keep absorbing rising costs while Ottawa keeps saying that help is coming. Help is not coming quickly enough, and sometimes it does not come at all. Grocery bills are up, rent is up, gas is up and insurance is up, especially in border communities like ours. I have met parents who have skipped meals so their kids could eat. I have met seniors who ride one bus to buy slightly cheaper bread and then another to pick up prescriptions, because every dollar matters.

Budget slogans do not fill kitchen cupboards. Press conferences do not lower bills. Families do not need speeches; they need policy that delivers. That is why budget delays matter. That is why every month counts. That is why people are asking, "If families cannot delay their bills, why was the government allowed to delay the budget this long?"

Second, how does the government spend record-high deficit money and still deliver less? I want to be fair here. I understand that the government had to spend more money during COVID, but what people want now is clarity. If we are posting the largest deficits in Canadian history outside of a crisis, the results should be tangible, visible and undeniable. That is not the case here.

In communities like mine, what we see instead are gaps. Seniors are falling behind because they are on fixed incomes. Students are taking on more debt with fewer job guarantees. New immigrants are driving for Uber because they cannot match their skills with the jobs available. That is a failure of immigration policies. Small businesses are shuttering due to high costs. Families are lining up at food banks in record numbers, and churches are stepping in to fill the gaps. When the government spends this much and life still gets harder, something is fundamentally wrong.

The people in Windsor understand budgets. Households have them, shops have them and shift workers plan around them. They know they cannot put everything on a credit card and hope that tomorrow pays for yesterday, yet the government continues down that road, asking Canadians to trust that it will all balance out someday. The former prime minister said the budget would balance itself, but nothing balances itself. Someday is not a plan, and eventually is not a strategy.

That brings me to question number two: How do we have record spending and record deficits and still have record amounts of struggle on our homes and streets?

Third, if Windsor feels the fire of a trade war, why does the Prime Minister say there is no "burning issue"? We are a border city. We feel trade pressures before anyone else in the country. With one slowdown at the bridge, one tariff or one retaliatory measure, Windsor pays first.

We have lived this reality for decades, but this week, the Prime Minister suggested the trade dispute with the United States is not a burning issue; it is just a minor detail. He asked, "Who cares?" These are not words that Windsor West expects a prime minister to say. Jobs, exports, tool-shops and auto supply chains are not just background noise; they are real people, and these struggles matter.

Government Orders

• (1045)

Windsor cares. The workers at Titan Tool and Die care. They have been shut out of the factory because the owners have moved their operations across the Detroit River, and management is not even talking to the workers anymore. Toolmakers do not need slogans; they need fairness, predictable policy and respect from their own leadership, because when a trade war hits, the blast radius directly impacts border communities like mine. I ask the government, plainly and directly, question number three: If our manufacturing sector is sweating from the heat, how does the Prime Minister not see the flames?

Fourth, why are we encouraging Canadian pension funds to invest in the U.A.E. or the U.S.A. while Canada is put on ice? I want Canadians to hear this clearly: While our economy contracts, Brookfield is signing deals around the world at a breakneck pace, and Canada, somehow, is left standing in the hallway. We are watching pension capital flow offshore while we desperately need investment here at home. The company most associated with these deals has quietly benefited more than almost any other in the country, while average families pay the price.

People ask me questions at coffee shops, at the arena or at the temple after prayers: How do we have money for foreign investments but not enough for new homes or lower food costs? Why can Brookfield close deals abroad while Canadians struggle to pay more rent at home? How did the government become more interested in pleasing global finance, as with Brookfield, than its own workers? These are not wild conspiracy questions; these are kitchen-table questions. The fact that Canadians even need to ask them is alarming, in and of itself. Let me place this question question on the floor of this House: Why is the government prioritizing global investors over Canadian workers who built this country with their own blood, sweat and tears?

Fifth, if this budget can move billions internationally, why can it not move projects in Windsor? This is where it becomes a reality for my hometown. Let us talk about the Gordie Howe International Bridge, a transformational project that was delayed, redated and adjusted, and still we do not have a firm final opening date. Businesses are planning logistics in a blind fashion. Truckers are paying premium rates for aging infrastructure. Small companies are wasting hours while idling at border queues. Do members want to know how to kill a business slowly? It is by taking away predictability.

Then there is the Ojibway national urban park, an environmental jewel, a generational opportunity and a chance for preservation, stewardship, education and pride, yet the file is shuffled, pushed back and still waiting. Windsor waits and waits, and at some point, that waiting ends up eroding trust and begins to look like neglect. I am not here to pick a fight; I am here to ask for some fairness for our city. Every press release in Ottawa seems to come with fireworks, but in Windsor, we are still waiting for answers. We are waiting for timelines that do not move, like shadows on a wall.

Here is question number five: If the government can move money offshore in a heartbeat, why can it not move projects forward in Windsor? I am not standing here angrily. I stand here determined because Windsor matters, our workers matter, our future matters and Canadians matter. We are not asking for handouts; we are ask-

ing for fairness and for urgency. We are asking for leadership that treats border communities like economic engines, not afterthoughts. Families are tired of speeches; they want action. Seniors are tired of promises; they want affordability. Businesses are tired of waiting; they want Canada to compete, not retreat.

Today, on behalf of the people of Windsor, I have five questions. Where is the help? Why do the Liberals spend more and get less? Why is the trade war not a burning issue for the Prime Minister? Why are foreign investors prioritized over our workers? Why does Windsor keep getting told to wait?

Canadians are ready. Windsor is ready. It is time that the government showed up with a real action plan and did something for regular Canadians for a change.

• (1050)

[*Translation*]

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Windsor West for his speech. Windsor is being hit especially hard by the economic uncertainty we are currently facing. However, I would like to remind my colleague that the United States is the one causing that uncertainty. I am sure he is aware of that. The trade war started by our neighbours is affecting the Canadian economy, particularly in the Windsor area.

We are talking about the budget. Like several of his colleagues, the member mentioned that the deficit in the budget for this year is a record deficit, the largest deficit outside of a crisis.

Does my colleague not agree that we are currently in the midst of a crisis?

[*English*]

Harb Gill: Madam Speaker, that is a great question, and I could not agree more. The member seems to have his fingers on the pulse of Windsor.

It is a crisis, but a deficit becomes a problem when every dollar borrowed becomes extra pressure for ordinary Canadians. There is more inflation, higher interest rates and rising taxes down the road. Those in Windsor are not watching numbers on a spreadsheet; they are watching food prices, heating bills and mortgage renewals go up. Debt should support productivity and growth. Right now, the deficit supports speeches and press releases. That is not investment; that is borrowing with no payoff at the end of the road.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have asked my Conservative colleagues two questions now. I am not sure whether they have been given orders not to answer questions from the Bloc Québécois, but both times their answers completely sidestepped the very specific question I was asking.

What I am thinking now is that, if they want to replace the government one day, then they have to be able to answer questions when they are in the opposition, so I will ask a question that is very serious, very direct and very easy to understand.

My colleague completely tore apart the budget that was presented by the Liberal government and its implementation. My question is very simple. When it came time to vote, why did his party let this budget pass?

[English]

Harb Gill: Madam Speaker, I voted against the budget, pure and simple, and we tried our best to defeat it. It did not work out. Other members from other parties supported the budget. I cannot speak for them. I can speak for my colleagues. We did our best.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, Norway has \$1.9 trillion in its sovereign wealth fund. It earned over \$200 billion last year in dividends alone. That equates to about \$340,000 per citizen. Alberta's heritage fund looks like it is making sure that nurses and teachers are not getting the fair wages they deserve. It attacks their private health care system.

Last year, Imperial Oil earned \$5 billion, and it laid off 900 staff. We have the lowest corporate tax rate in the G7. The member talked about the G7.

Does he think things need to change and that the government needs to rein in corporate greed and rein in provinces that do not take care of their employees and workers, at a time when there are companies posting record profits and not even taking care of abandoned wells? We know that over \$1 billion is needed to repair those wells right now.

• (1055)

Harb Gill: Madam Speaker, what we are talking about here is cutting waste, cutting duplication and cutting the ballooning federal bureaucracy that has grown 80% since 2015. We need direct investment into things that create value, like homes, bridges and manufacturing, and not into endless consultants and political photo ops where there is a fake home behind the Prime Minister, and he stands before it and it is done.

That is not what we want. That is not what Canadians want. They have had enough of all those things. They need real action. They need something they can look at and say, tangibly, "This is what the government produced." Unicorns and rainbows do not make a difference anymore. We need real results that we can point to and say, "This is what the government did", because this—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We have to resume debate.

The hon. member for Niagara South.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to participate in the debate today, and it will come as no surprise that I will say up front that I will vote against the bill.

The Minister of Finance loves to yell in the House that this is a generational budget. What is clearly and unequivocally true is that this is a budget imposing massive, crushing and unforgivable generational debt. I cannot help but point out that our deficit is now just under \$80 billion, a number that would make even Justin Trudeau blush.

Canada's productivity has slipped badly among G7 nations. Why? Capital is staying on the sidelines as confidence lags. Investments in equipment, new innovation and business efficiencies are on hold because of basic economic uncertainty. That is the essence of productivity. The last thing our economy needs right now is uncertainty, yet here we are.

I have listened intently to my colleagues on the Liberal side of the House talk about this budget, and it left me wondering how so many people have suddenly come down with a case of "some-timers". Perhaps it is a form of political amnesia, because it seems that those on the front bench of this so-called new government have forgotten that they paved the way for this massive dive into new generational debt.

While the Prime Minister says his words were poorly chosen when he said "Who cares?" about dealing with Trump, what is said in jest often holds an element of truth. His "Who cares?" comment tells us a couple of things. Perhaps he is just going through the motions with the U.S., and CUSMA is the backstop, at least for now. He loves to say that Canada has the best deal right now. Well, frankly, that is a crock. We have the same CUSMA deal we had before the election, with a pile of new tariffs on everything outside that agreement. That is an abject failure. Maybe he does not care because he is hoping that Trump loses his court cases or perhaps loses control of Congress in the midterms, or that the U.S. economy finally feels the inevitable pain of tariffs, with job losses and inflation.

Silence and saying "Who cares?" are dangerous, misguided, irresponsible and frankly lazy. We are in a trade vacuum with a case of George Costanza's elbows-down shrinkage factor. Everyone knows it is a precarious game negotiating with Trump and his sycophant team of validators. Trump is a bit like Biff Tannen in *Back to the Future Part II*, where the bully controls the dystopian town and the people around him. Perhaps the strategy is just to wait him out and hope for the best.

When Trump opens up CUSMA, which he most certainly will, Canada's economic stability is literally on the table. The idea that we are going to supplant our trade with the U.S. with trade in other jurisdictions may appear to be an opportunity, but it is at best a long-term objective. If we ask anyone who has built a successful SME in Canada, they will tell us that it takes decades to develop the relationships and supply chains needed to provide solid predictability in our export markets.

Some 75% of Canada's exports go to the U.S. That may fluctuate, and it has over time, but fundamentally our relationship with the U.S. is never going to change in our lifetime. To suggest otherwise ignores facts, history and the natural political, geographic, economic and basic integration of our economies. The north-south network of supply chains, transportation and logistics, built over decades in relationships and confidence and trust in financial linkages, is not something that our manufacturing and service sector can abandon or miraculously recreate in other jurisdictions just because the Prime Minister says so.

It took 100 years for our economy to evolve to ensure the efficient movement of goods and capital and ensure stable supply chains. Saying that we are going to double trade with Europe is fine, but it is not going to fix our problems before CUSMA comes up for review. Let us be clear: Canada's economy has evolved over the past 50 years through technological change and the realization that trade liberalization was the only pathway to improving the Canadian standard of living.

Money flows to the path of least resistance balanced against return. Policy drives the creation of that path. However, as we developed our north-south trade strategy, we abdicated our responsibility in supporting a national manufacturing strategy and, most importantly, a national access to capital strategy.

• (1100)

I know this because I have spent the past 20 years helping Canadian start-ups commercialize their ideas against strong and sometimes insurmountable barriers against capital access. There were incredible successes in the Canadian start-up ecosystem, like Shopify and Hootsuite, among many others. BlackBerry is literally responsible for the creation of the Waterloo innovation machine that paved the way for Canadian entrepreneurs to chase their dreams.

The Harper government launched an incredibly helpful program to enhance the innovation sector through support to the angel investing community. It was inexpensive yet enormously successful, and it bridged the gap between ideas and capital. Angel investor groups popped up across Canada and aggregated substantial amounts of capital to support Canadian companies. Sadly, the Trudeau government cancelled this program.

Over the past 10 years, we have missed the boat in establishing an access-to-capital platform to support companies beyond the early stage phase. Regional development agencies could have been the platform for this, but are basically acting as bailout agencies instead of a network of strategic investment for Canadian start-ups.

I have seen dozens of companies leave for the U.S. simply because they could not obtain funding in Canada. The U.S. offered the solutions to risk-averse Canadians to provide a runway of sup-

Government Orders

port to these companies that wanted to stay here but simply could not turn down the opportunities south of the border. This should be low-hanging fruit for us. If the government is intent on nosediving our nation into debt, how about we first take a look at how we fund our brightest and best in this country and try to fix the gap between capital and ideas.

We need to incentivize Canadian capital to actually invest and stay here in Canada. Eight out of 10 start-ups ultimately fail. Angel investors, angel funds and venture capital funding vehicles are familiar with this risk, but as we navigate this uncertain time, as I said earlier, capital is staying on the sidelines. Fifteen years ago, it was easier for us to attract early-stage investment because it was the policy priority of the federal and provincial governments. Accredited investors organized and went on a tear of investing in Canadian companies. It was a beautiful thing, but investing fatigue has now set in because deal flow is weak and confidence is low.

The incentives for investing in start-ups today in Canada are non-existent. That is the barrier to investment. That is the tragedy of where we missed the chance over the last 10 years to provide incentives for investment. To be clear, this is not a tax break for the rich; this is an incentive for people who are willing to take risk on Canadian companies. Make no mistake: The risk is high. The two out of 10 that actually make it to market need years of mentoring and support, with multiple rounds of investment. Unless we are prepared to support this ecosystem, we will continue to tilt at windmills, watch our best and brightest move south and continue to weaken our domestic innovation ecosystem.

My leader is onto something. He is really onto something when he talks about eliminating capital gains taxes, provided that the gains are invested in Canadian companies. People understand this at the ground level. If we could provide this kind of incentive to support Canadian start-ups, we could build a more diversified economy where Canadian companies and capital stay here and grow here. This is the real nation-building effort, one company at a time. It will create confidence and enthusiasm and bring massive private capital reserves back into our economy.

Canada is over-regulated, overtaxed, disincentivized and uncompetitive, with the worst productivity rate in the G7. The government says it wants new ideas. I just threw several at it, all validated by past best practices and all cancelled by the Liberals.

Government Orders

The Liberals talk a good game, but talk is cheap. The “we believe in Canada” ad nauseam is offensive to me. It suggests that only Liberals believe in Canada. I also believe in Canada. My life's work has been dedicated to creating value for Canadians, jobs for Canadians and growth in my region.

My small grandchildren will pay the price for this, and only Conservatives will bring sanity and solid fiscal policy back to our country and put Canada first.

• (1105)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, here is a very quick flashback. As we are talking about foreign investment leaving Canada and going to other countries, in particular the United States, I will remind the member that when his leader sat around cabinet, we had the biggest destruction of the manufacturing industry in the province of Ontario in generations. Fast-forward to today. We have a Prime Minister who is attracting hundreds of millions, going into billions, of dollars of investment to Canada from around the world as we look at ways to expand trade opportunities.

I appreciate the member raising his ideas, but I think we need to recognize the substantive difference in the way the government has approached increasing trade, doing so with our one Canadian economy, by expanding opportunities and by bringing investments, into the billions of dollars, to Canada because of the efforts of the Prime Minister.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts on that. Does he support the Prime Minister's travels given the degree to which he has been successful at bringing in export opportunities for his constituents and indeed for all Canadians?

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, that was the most delusional question I have heard since I was elected.

The Prime Minister has been on 28 trips around the world for photo ops, handshakes and MOUs that are non-binding. Not a dollar has set foot in Canada yet.

I would like the hon. member to give me the name of a specific company that has moved capital into Canada. Right now, capital is leaving Canada at record rates to the U.S. That is where we need to focus our attention, not on the fictitious view that letters of intent and memorandums of understanding have any meaning at all. It is all photo ops and gaslighting.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, earlier, my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean asked a Conservative member a question after his speech. He noted that the Conservatives tore apart the Liberal budget in their speeches, and rightly so. However, my colleague wanted to know what efforts the Conservatives made to defeat this budget. The Conservative member replied that his party tried its best to defeat that budget when it came time to vote.

The Bloc Québécois has 22 members, and all 22 members voted against this budget. I would like to know how many of the 143 Conservative members actually voted against this budget, not counting the curtains.

[*English*]

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, if the question is how many Conservative members voted for the budget, the answer is zero. We all voted against the budget. I voted against the budget. This is a generational disaster of debt for Canadians. When I said the amount of deficit we are going to accrue this year would make Justin Trudeau blush, I meant that this is a generational catastrophe that my grandchildren are going to pay for.

I will vote against the budget again, vote against all of the enabling legislation and be proud to do it.

• (1110)

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague just gave an excellent speech, and in that speech, he mentioned capital flight, which is a real concern in Canada at the moment. We recently heard that another company, a Canadian company that actually has a mine in my riding, is now building an export terminal in the United States instead of Canada because of overtaxation, over-regulation and overburdening by the Liberal government.

Could my colleague expand a bit on why policy matters and why it is important to have pro-business, business-friendly policies in Canada?

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, I want to take that a step further. Not only are we over-regulated, overtaxed and disincentivized regarding investment coming into Canada, but the upfront costs of getting access to capital in this country are enormous. Companies are fleeing to the U.S. because there are incentive programs there, especially in California in the technology sector. They can get funding in innovation centres in California far faster than they can in Canada. It is a burden here.

We need to deregulate and get rid of red tape. Just building an industrial building in this country right now can take years before shovels are put in the ground. The cost of development charges, fees and regulation is outrageous. We have painted ourselves into a corner over the last 20 years and it needs to stop. The Conservative Party will put a stop to it.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister was elected on a promise that the Liberals would stand strong against Trump and would fight American tariffs. He even did an elbows-up dance following the election.

What has the Liberals' rhetoric, with Canada strong against Trump and elbows up, looked like since the election? The U.S. has imposed a 35% levy on all Canadian goods, even though most are exempt under an existing free trade agreement. Trump has slapped sector-specific levies on Canadian goods, including a 50% levy on metals and a 25% levy on automobiles. Trump has imposed a new 10% tariff to the existing anti-dumping and countervailing duties on Canadian lumber, bringing the levy to over 45% and crippling the industry. In addition, 25% has been imposed on certain finished wood products.

In the Prime Minister's definition of elbows up to appease Trump, he has rescinded the digital services tax, which is a 3% tax for massive multinational companies operating in Canada such as Google, Amazon and Netflix. This is a tax the Parliamentary Budget Officer projects would generate over \$7 billion in new revenues over five years for Canadians.

While the Prime Minister wanted Canadians to believe that every tariff blow Trump threw our way was met with retaliatory counter-tariffs, in reality, after the initial hurrah, the Liberals removed all tariffs on goods from the U.S. that are covered by CUSMA. They then quietly removed countertariffs on American goods that are not compliant with CUSMA.

As if the Prime Minister was put on steroids to further appease Trump, he committed to boosting defence funding from 2% to 5% of GDP, and we saw a commitment of a whopping \$81.5 billion over five years made in budget 2025.

It does not stop there. To further placate Trump, under the guise of border security to address Trump's imagined fentanyl border crisis, Bill C-12 was the Prime Minister's first piece of legislation in this House, a dangerous omnibus bill that threatens Canadians' civil liberties, infringes on their privacy rights, eliminates due process and takes a page directly from Trump's anti-refugee, anti-rule-of-law agenda.

When Trump took offence to an ad that accurately recounted former president Reagan's view on tariffs, the Prime Minister kow-towed to Trump and apologized. This is not exactly elbows up, is it?

The Prime Minister's actions are a far cry from his election promises to Canadians, and as it stands, Canada has become the only G7 nation without a trade deal with the U.S.

During the campaign, the Prime Minister promised Canadians he would get clean energy projects built. At no point did he say he would end the tanker ban and build a new pipeline. What is the Prime Minister doing? He is signing an MOU with Premier Danielle Smith on advancing a new pipeline to the B.C. coast, an agreement developed behind closed doors with zero consultation with B.C. and first nations.

British Columbians do not want another megaproject that increases emissions and threatens coastal ecosystems. The Prime Minister cannot justify negotiating a pipeline deal with Alberta that excludes B.C. entirely, affected first nations and impacted communities. None of them has been at the table.

Government Orders

British Columbians will not stand for the lifting of the tanker ban, and B.C. Liberal members know it. Instead of sowing division, why does the Prime Minister not work on truly nation-building projects that are good for the economy and the environment and help Canada meet its Paris accord commitments?

Canadians were told that budget 2025 is a bold statement of generational ambition. They were shown the headline figure of \$1 trillion in public and private investments over five years and told that this budget would secure the future of Canada, yet despite all the fanfare, few Canadians feel inspired. Why? It is because the budget, at its core, is underwhelming, contradictory and deeply conservative in its priorities.

• (1115)

It is back to the future with austerity and the Liberal government.

The Prime Minister calls this a “generational investment budget”, but it is not the kind of investment that working Canadians have been asking for. It misses the mark.

The budget shifts resources away from everyday people in an affordability crisis. It has very little investment in indigenous communities and indigenous-led projects, and there is no mention of the calls for justice on missing and murdered indigenous women and girls.

It delivers deep cuts, at 15% across most ministries, and downsizes critical public services, all to make room for a record increase in military spending. The government is reining in its day-to-day spending through a so-called comprehensive expenditure review, cutting \$13 billion annually by 2028-29, for a total of \$60 billion in savings, it says. That means shrinking public services, targeting the very frontline workers who deliver the essential care that everyday Canadians rely on.

The Prime Minister hides the impact of the cuts in euphemism. The budget is riddled with terms such as “modernizing”, “streamlining” and “recalibrating”. What does that really mean? It really means that services will be cut, and it imposes austerity that disproportionately affects women, frontline workers and vulnerable communities.

Government Orders

For the workers and families who have lost their jobs, or the 40,000 workers who will lose their jobs because of the 15% cut across all departments, with a few minor exceptions, there is no support for them in budget 2025. There is no EI reform for these workers and their families, retraining or transition; there is no support for them. It is not exactly a worker-friendly budget, is it? Canadians are struggling with the cost of living, a housing crisis and an overstretched health care system, yet the government is asking workers and families to tighten their belts while defence contractors get a windfall.

The cuts to the federal public services are short-sighted and unnecessary. These are the people who process benefits, GIS applications for seniors, tax refunds and EI applications, which are services that keep government running. Undermining these things means undermining services that Canadians need. A truly generational budget would invest in people, in affordable homes, green jobs, public health care, climate change mitigation and a post-secondary education system that has been decimated by the Liberals' mismanagement of student visas.

On the issue around housing, Build Canada Homes comes with a lot of hype and promises. The government talks about delivering 40% affordable units and deep affordability tied to 30% of the median income. It turns out that this commitment only applies to six sites. For the rest, there are no affordability criteria attached. Not only that, but there is only \$6.5 billion of new money in budget 2025; the rest of the \$25 billion is carried over from previous budgets. With that, so far, the only target we have heard from the government is that 4,000 new homes are scheduled to start next year. This is a drop in the bucket of the million non-market housing units needed over a decade to address backlogs.

The government is also leaning heavily on provinces to subsidize deep affordability. With no firm commitments, and without clear affordability guarantees, Build Canada Homes will fail to deliver the affordable homes Canadians desperately need.

Budget 2025 promises a lot, a trillion dollars of investment, but most of it is pre-committed, reclassified or private sector investment that may never materialize. The government talks a lot, and there is a lot of fanfare and hype, but in reality, much of it is just hot air, with recycled announcements and recalibration of existing programs and investments that have already been committed. A \$25-billion headline number shrinks to just \$0.3 billion in new R and D—

• (1120)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member who just spoke is a part of the Conservative Party of Canada alliance to try to cause an election. This is the reality. She actually voted with the Conservative Party.

At the end of the day, what is in the budget? It is a budget that provides pharmacare, dental care and food for children in schools. She actually believes the Conservative Party would be better at governing Canada than the current Liberal Party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: The Conservative Party stands and gives her applause.

Madam Speaker, at the end of the day, does she truly believe the investments that the budget is making into communities from coast to coast to coast would be better done with the Conservative Party? Is that what she really believes? Why could she not identify things in the budget that are to the benefit of her community and, indeed, all Canadians, and vote—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Vancouver East.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, well, let me be very clear: I voted against the Liberals. I did not vote with the Conservatives; I voted against the Liberals. Why? The NDP actually tried to make this work and went to the government, saying we would support the budget if, for example, it invested \$1.5 billion in co-op housing with affordability criteria attached; if, in fact, it brought forward an EI support program for workers who are going to be losing their jobs; and if it would not impose cuts that would impact indigenous people's services, for example.

There was a list of things we brought to the government, and it rejected them. This is what we voted against: the government refusing to support the Canadians who need help the most during this affordability crisis.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, thank you for maintaining order here in the House. That is the way it should be. I want to highlight that and tell you how much I appreciate it. I just came from a committee meeting where, once again, there was a lot of partisan behaviour. It was all very performative.

I am tired of the debate focusing on whether or not people voted against the budget. Can we please talk about the real issues? When I go home to my riding, people ask me if the government is abandoning the forestry industry. When I ask my colleague a question, I want to hear actual facts. I want to hear constructive ideas, specific measures.

We are going to go home to our ridings, where the forestry industry is one of the economic drivers and where people are concerned about climate change, so I would ask my colleagues to stop talking about whether they voted for or against the budget.

What does my colleague think?

*Government Orders**[English]*

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, I will tell the House what I was looking for in the budget that I did not see. I was looking for affordable housing at scale, that is, a million units over a decade to deliver for and address the affordability housing crisis. I was looking for community housing for people in Quebec, in British Columbia and across the country, not a measly \$500-million investment that will barely, barely have an impact. We were looking for investment in public transit in Quebec and in British Columbia. We were looking for an east-west energy grid connecting provinces with clean energy. Instead, Canadians are left with incremental changes, tax breaks for corporations and more austerity for the public sector. Not to mention, there was no support for the environment.

- (1125)

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Madam Speaker, in her speech, the member characterized this as a Conservative budget. While there were elements of it lifted from our election campaign, and I want to thank the government for including some of those measures, I will agree with her in that we both opposed the budget but, obviously, for varying reasons. What makes this not a Conservative budget is the fact that there is a \$78.3-billion deficit.

Would the member across the way not agree, with the fallout of a \$78.3-billion deficit, the inflation that will surely again fall, the bills that will be in today's and future taxes on our children and our grandchildren, those effects affect the very people the member across the way is purportedly trying to help? The effects fall disproportionately to the lower socio-economic levels, the very people she identified in her speech as those she wants to help.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, this is an austerity budget. This is actually what the Conservatives want. However, we do not support this. What the NDP called for was for the government to protect services, to support working families and to ensure deeper affordability measures. If we are serious about Canada's future, about—

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

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House on behalf of the constituents and families in Foothills, my farmers, my ranchers, my agri-food processors and certainly my families and entrepreneurs.

Bill C-15, the budget implementation act, is anything but a plan for prosperity. It is a blueprint for higher taxes, higher debt, higher inflation and higher costs for the people who feed and power this economy. I could probably summarize the Liberal budget in two ways: It is a budget of over-promising and underdelivery.

In the previous election, the Prime Minister promised Canadians fiscal restraint, transformational change and fiscal discipline. Once again, the Liberals failed to deliver on any of those things. I would warn the Liberals that they cannot build the Canada of tomorrow, which all of us want to see, if they are mortgaging the future. This is exactly what the budget has done, with almost \$80 billion in additional debt burden on the backs of Canadian taxpayers.

As a result of this, our standard of living is eroding. That is a concern for an entire generation of young Canadians, who are starting to accept that this type of debt and deficit is becoming the norm. Others have certainly noticed. For example, out of the 48 countries tracked by the OECD, Canada is expected to rank second worst in per capita growth from now until 2030. Canada has the worst per capita growth in the G7, with more than a 10% drop in investment per worker.

A decade ago that certainly was not the reality for Canadians. Under the previous Conservative government, we had the wealthiest middle class in the world. We had a balanced budget. We were respected by our most important and trusted trading partners. For the most part, Canadian families had hope. Instead, the Liberal government has chosen to burden and throw gas on the inflationary fire, with \$90 billion in new spending and a \$78 billion deficit.

Unbelievably, the Liberal government's deficit is twice that of the previous prime minister, Justin Trudeau, with a deficit and reckless spending that sent his finance minister packing. I find it incredibly interesting that only a year ago, the Liberal members were scrambling, outraged at the reckless spending of the predecessor, but now they are standing and cheering deficits and spending that are twice that of Justin Trudeau. It is incredible how things have changed on the Liberal benches and how easily they will twist themselves just to ensure that they win an election.

To put this in perspective, the cost of just maintaining that debt is more than \$50 billion a year. That is more than what the federal government is transferring to provinces in health care. Instead of building hospitals, hiring doctors and nurses, or expanding ports and repairing highways, more than \$50 billion in taxpayer money is going just to service the Liberal debt. That is an incredible number. I hope Canadians who are watching here today understand the consequences and ramifications of those kinds of numbers.

For Canadians, it is very hard to fathom that. For Canadians who are standing in line waiting for a family doctor or waiting hours on end in the emergency, I want them to think about the fact that we have solutions for those problems. However, instead of funds going to solve those problems, they are going to pay down just the interest on Canada's credit card as a result of the Liberals' out-of-control spending. As typical Liberals, they promise one thing during an election and do the exact opposite once they are elected.

During the election, they promised transformational change and generational investment. However, what they have delivered is intergenerational debt, and it will take generations of Canadians to try to pay this back. Canadians are not fooled. Even some of the Liberals' best friends are not fooled.

Government Orders

I would like to mention some headlines that have come out since the budget was released. We have, from the Toronto Sun, “[The Prime Minister’s] budget as unsustainable as a Trudeau budget”; from the National Post, “Liberals should be kept far away from the economy”; from The Globe and Mail, “The Liberals’ growing deficit of trust”; and from the Liberals’ favourite publication, the Toronto Star, “Once again, [the Prime Minister] doesn’t quite live up to the hype”.

These warnings are coming in when Canadians are struggling as they never have before.

● (1130)

Food Banks Canada reported that more than two million Canadians are being forced to line up at food banks every single month. That number has more than doubled over the last five years. It is unbelievable that four out of five Canadians now list food security as their number one financial burden. How does that happen in a country as wealthy as Canada, or seemingly as wealthy, until the Liberals got out of control with their spending?

This is hitting all of us in our ridings. For example, at the Okotoks Food Bank, in one of the largest communities in my riding, food bank use is up 200%. In the first seven months of last year, it had about 15,000 users; it now has more than 45,000. In my small hometown of High River, more than 100 families are using the food bank every single week. That is absolutely unbelievable in a country like Canada.

Food banks were never designed to be the backbone of a social safety net, but that is exactly what has happened under the Liberals. The food banks are now becoming a primary source of groceries for too many Canadian families, when they are supposed to be the source of last resort. This is a new reality Canadian families are facing.

I want to touch on a subject about which the Liberals are really gaslighting Canadians. They are trying to say that the hidden taxes the Liberals have put on food prices are imaginary. They are not imaginary. In fact Canadians are seeing the impact of these taxes every single week when they try to go to the grocery store and put food on the table. How can these taxes be imaginary when they are actually included in the Liberal budget?

In the Liberal budget, the Liberals say they are going to maintain the escalator tax on beer, wine and spirits. It is actually connected to inflation, so the Liberals cannot even say how high the escalator tax is going to be when it hits on April 1. It says in the budget that they are going to maintain the Liberal fuel standard, which adds 17¢ a litre for farmers who grow the food, truckers who move the food, and certainly the retailers who sell the food.

In the budget, the Liberals also say they are going to strengthen, which means increase, the industrial carbon tax, which increases the cost of literally everything. It not only increases those costs but also drives investment and industry out of Canada. As my colleague from Saskatchewan mentioned earlier, we have seen the consequences of that when a \$1 billion new potash terminal is going to be built in Vancouver, Washington, not Vancouver, British Columbia.

Nutrien is one of the largest potash producers in the world, based proudly in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, but one of Canada’s crown jewel industries is not investing in Canada. It is investing in the United States because of a regulatory regime in Canada that is un-navigable and because of high tax rates. It simply cannot carry the burden.

That is just the latest warning sign that we have seen as a result of Liberal taxes and a regulatory regime that are driving investment away. In fact more than \$50 billion in investment has fled Canada since the Prime Minister was elected last spring. Since 2015, and this is a staggering number, 670 billion dollars’ worth of resource projects have been either shelved or delayed as a result of the high taxes and regulatory regime of the Liberal government.

I just want to name a few of the projects that would certainly impact everybody across Canada. The Teck frontier mine, the northern gateway pipeline, energy east, the Saguenay LNG project and Pacific NorthWest LNG have all been shelved as a result of the Liberal government. Imagine the jobs that Canadians would have, had these projects gone ahead.

Finally, I want to mention this: The Liberals continue to say they are in a trade war, but we cannot be in a war if we have already surrendered. They have backed down on everything. Conservatives stand ready to work with anyone who is committed to getting Canada back on track and unleashing our resources like agriculture, mining and energy to provide Canada with the tools we need to face these challenges, to be successful and to have hope. Conservatives are willing to get that work done, and that is why we cannot support the budget, because the Liberals are certainly not willing to make those sacrifices.

● (1135)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, a year ago at this time I stood in the chamber and was talking about foreign investment. I said that Canada was number one in the G7 in terms of foreign investment coming into Canada. We were number three in the entire world.

The Conservatives try to paint a black picture of Canada. I suggest to the member that Canada is not broken. In fact we have a proactive, aggressive Prime Minister who is travelling abroad to bring in hundreds of millions of dollars of investment. He is expanding trade opportunities. Canada is a trading nation. The member can put whatever spin he wants on it, but the Prime Minister and the government are working night and day to ensure that we will have the strongest economy in the country. That is our goal, and I believe we will achieve it.

Does the member opposite support the Prime Minister’s initiative to get out there, get exports for Canada and wait to get the best deal we can for Canada-U.S. trade?

Government Orders

John Barlow: Madam Speaker, my short answer is that I do not. Every time the Prime Minister goes away, it gets worse for Canadians. I will talk just about agriculture.

The Prime Minister goes to India, and India puts 30% tariffs on Canadian yellow peas. He goes to the United States, and the United States increases tariffs for Canadians. The Liberals send a delegation to China, and what does China do? It increases tariffs on Canadian agriculture products from 25% to 100%. Canola, peas, pork, beef and seafood are now all being tariffed at record rates. The Prime Minister goes to the United Kingdom, and what does he get? Absolutely nothing. We get zero beef and pork imported by the United Kingdom and the European Union. However, what comes the other way? Beef imports into Canada from the United Kingdom are up 150%.

Every time the Prime Minister goes somewhere, when he comes back, it is worse, except that he somehow gets great deals for Brookfield and enriches his own pockets.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech, which was thorough and to the point as always.

We have talked a lot about things in this budget that are not good for ordinary people. For example, we talked about the \$100 billion in tax credits that are still being given to the oil and gas industry, even though it logs record-breaking profits year after year.

That said, there is one thing that was in the last two budgets but is not in this one: a plan to pass legislation on forced labour and child labour. There is nothing in this budget about the government's intentions in that regard. That was one good intention the government had back when it truly cared about human rights.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton introduced Bill C-251, which would reverse the burden of proof in cases of forced labour and child labour. Do the Conservatives agree that we absolutely have to pass this bill and that we have to do the government's job because it is incapable of doing it?

• (1140)

[*English*]

John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I just want to touch on a couple of things in my colleague's question. I think he has highlighted very well that the budget is about what is not there. What is not there is the details.

The Liberals talk a lot about spending, but the success of a budget is not about how much we spend; it is about the impact that spending is going to have. We do not see anything about expanding ports, repairing highways, diversifying trade or how we will get our products to market. To the member's first point, yes, the biggest issue with the budget is not what is missing; it is a lot of fanfare and no details.

On the member's second question, I would agree. I have not had a chance to read the bill he mentioned. It is something the Bloc is very passionate about, and certainly I think all of us are. My colleague from northern Alberta talks about human trafficking and hu-

man slavery. I think we would all support cracking down on those issues.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think we heard very clearly the attitude the Prime Minister has toward Canadians, when this past weekend, when asked about the ongoing trade discussions with the U.S., he said, "Who cares?" He said it is not a burning issue and that it does not matter. I have been very clear that it matters in my riding, where yet another mill announced a closure yesterday, with the loss of 100 more jobs.

There is blatant arrogance and a dismissive attitude toward all Canadians from the Prime Minister when we bring up these issues. Can the member comment on that?

John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I would say to my incredible colleague from Cariboo—Prince George that I could not agree more. The message being sent to Canadians, especially in the forestry and energy sectors, is that the Prime Minister, at one of the most critical times in our history, just does not care. I think that says all there is to say.

[*Translation*]

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my turn to speak to Bill C-15 and, of course, the budget.

The budget tabled on November 4 is about building a stronger and more prosperous Canada. It essentially boils down to three themes: building, protecting and empowering Canada. I will discuss these three broad themes in greater detail in a moment, but before I do, I would like to put the budget into context.

The context is that the world has changed. The world has changed in the last year or so, ever since a new administration came to power down south and implemented a trade policy that is unusual, to say the least. We are not in a situation of cyclical change where things are likely to go back to normal within a few quarters. No, we are facing a major economic shock. On top of that, this shock follows two previous events that severely disrupted the Canadian economy, specifically the global financial crisis in 2007-08 and the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, so this is the third successive shock to hit the Canadian economy.

Government Orders

What has been happening for the past year or so is very serious and very grave. The shift in global trade resulting from policy changes in the United States is weakening multilateral institutions, the rule of law, and trust between economic partners. The imposition of arbitrary, unfair and illegal tariffs has a twofold impact: first, supply chains are being reconfigured, and second, many companies are learning that in order to sell to the United States, they must manufacture in the United States. This is causing many problems for all trading partners, but it is also causing problems for us, since our economies are closely intertwined. This situation is causing prices to increase across the board, fuelling inflation and creating additional problems. As has been mentioned several times, the United States accounts for 75% to 80% of our exports. It is therefore clear that we are the country most affected by these major changes.

We understand very well that this situation calls for the government to meet the moment with a strong, ambitious, massive response. That is what we have delivered in budget 2025. Ultimately, we are doing what we said we would do. We are simply implementing what we promised.

It is worth noting that what we are essentially doing is reorienting the Government of Canada's economic policy to clearly encourage investment. This is an investment budget that will increase our production capacity and help Canada transition to an economy that is less dependent on the U.S. economy. We are planning to invest about \$280 billion in infrastructure and other areas, which should catalyze close to \$1 trillion in total investments. That is one-third of Canada's GDP. Obviously, there are risks involved, and it is clear that this is not a given. Indeed, there is no 100% guarantee that these investments will happen. However, with the measures we are putting in place, we are confident that these investments will materialize.

• (1145)

In fact, we think that the biggest risk would be to take no risks at all and table a budget more in keeping with the norm. For at least the past three months, our Conservative colleagues have repeatedly floated the idea of a truly conservative budget approach. That is not our approach. What they are proposing is an austerity approach. Right now, with all the upheaval coming from outside the country, this kind of approach would certainly lead us into a very serious recession.

What we gather from our Conservative friends' statements is that their fiscal approach would most likely reduce investment by \$50 billion to \$60 billion. As others have already mentioned, that kind of austerity would be downright toxic, because it would weaken the economy even more at a time when it is already weak.

A number of studies have mentioned the need for fiscal restraint, but the blind austerity proposed by our Conservative colleagues would have made the situation much worse.

Is sustainability really a problem as far as Canada's fiscal policies are concerned?

[*English*]

Is the Canadian public debt sustainable or not sustainable? Would a deficit of \$78 billion in the budget be manageable or not

manageable? Would this deficit generate, as our friends maintain, massive inflation, or would it support the economy, allow us to expand the supply side of the economy and, in fact, contribute to having fewer inflationary pressures? We think it is the latter.

A deficit of \$78 billion is a deficit of 2.5% of GDP. That is perfectly manageable. That is a lot less than many of our partners have, whether it is the United States or even countries in Europe. Our level of public debt is around 43% of GDP, and it would remain in that range for the next five years, which is a level of debt that is sustainable.

Members do not need to take my word for it. Members can look at the financial markets and at what is going on in the bond market. Where are the long-term bond yields? They are lower now in absolute terms than they were in 2006, when there was another government in place at that time. Therefore, our debt is sustainable. We can and we do afford it. We are able to finance that debt.

Interest payments over GDP are a lot less now than what they were in the 1990s. It seems to me that our Conservative friends appear to still be living in the 1990s. We are no longer in the 1990s. The world has changed. We are now at a point in time, in 2025, when those of us who believe that the state has an important role to play are doing it, and those of us who believe that the state should just step aside, well, they will see how that goes in countries where that is taking place. It would be making a bad situation 10 times worse if the state were to withdraw from the economy at this point.

We need to promote investment. We need to make sure that our economy is efficient and productive and that the private sector finds reasons to invest and projects to invest in. We will support that.

• (1150)

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really appreciated the member's speech as it was quite entertaining. There was this new term of "clever austerity", which I guess is the reverse of austerity. The word "clever" makes the word "austerity" mean the opposite.

Justin Trudeau, in all of his time in power, outside of COVID, never had a budget that had this much deficit spending in it. If this is what clever austerity is, I do not know what actual austerity looks like.

Carlos Leitão: Madam Speaker, I am not quite sure I fully understand the question from my colleague because I never said "clever austerity". I just said that this is not the time to impose toxic austerity. This is not the time to cut government spending blindly and hope that the invisible hand will somehow address the structural issues we are facing, which are very serious. The invisible hand does not always work and will not work in the midst of a serious shock, which we are now living with.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to ask my colleague a question. The Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates met with the Parliamentary Budget Officer. I had a very simple question for him, namely, what is an investment? He replied, of course, that it is capital put into equipment or a means of production, and that it therefore falls under the category of assets.

I was also told that the new unit of measurement is similar to that used in Quebec, and I think my colleague is very familiar with the difference between Quebec's infrastructure plan, the PQI, and current expenditures. Here is my question. With all this talk of owning equipment, what does the federal government really have to show for its so-called investment?

Carlos Leitão: Madam Speaker, our interpretation differs from that of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. We disagree with him, but I would also like to point out that we are not hiding anything in the budget.

The deficit is there. The \$68 billion is there. There is nothing hidden, but we believe that measures such as tax credits that support and accelerate investment should be considered an investment measure.

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, can my colleague remind the House how this investment budget truly supports families, businesses and the regions of Quebec and Canada, particularly at a time when some parties would rather engage in fearmongering and sensationalism?

The Conservatives voted against the budget, as did the Bloc Québécois members, who are always saying that what is good for Quebec is good for them.

Could you explain why, contrary to what they are saying, this budget represents a responsible, ambitious and future-oriented approach, far removed from the alarmist rhetoric that we have been hearing so much of from our colleagues opposite?

• (1155)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I would like to remind the hon. member that I am unable to respond to him. However, I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary will do so.

Carlos Leitão: Madam Speaker, there are many measures in the budget, several of which are particularly good for Quebec. I am talking about our ongoing unwavering support for culture, for Radio-Canada, for example. We are also supporting the social programs that make Canada what it is.

We are not like other countries. We believe that we have a duty to help one another and to stand together. Programs like the Canada child benefit, the national school food program and old age security are well worth continuing. They must be maintained, and that is what we are doing.

[English]

Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, I have two questions for the member: One, was he making the point in his speech that this is an

austerity budget? Two, will he confirm for me, as he been a finance minister before, that deficit spending does drive inflation?

Carlos Leitão: Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I do not think I have enough time, as this is a very important issue. However, no and no, in the sense that this is not an austerity budget, but what the Conservatives are proposing would be a toxic austerity budget, and a deficit of this magnitude at this time does not lead to inflation.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege for me to stand here this morning to speak on behalf of the many hard-working constituents in Provencher, my riding, to address this budget implementation act.

A government is judged by the condition of its people. Our Prime Minister stated that he should be judged by the prices at the grocery store. As of today, that would be a failing grade. After only eight months, the Prime Minister is already a failure by his own measure. After ten years of Liberal promises, Canadians are poorer, families are struggling to feed themselves, the young cannot start their lives and the old cannot finish their lives in peace.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer called the government's path "stupefying", "shocking" and "unsustainable", and said, "if you don't change, this is done."

The warning could not be clearer, and it reminds me of an old urban legend. This is a transcript of a radio conversation of a U.S. naval ship with Canadian authorities off the coast of Newfoundland in October, 1995, and the radio conversation was released by the chief of naval operations on October 10, 1995.

The Americans, in their first radio transmission, asked the Canadians to please divert their course 15° to the north to avoid a collision.

The Canadians said that they recommend that the Americans divert their course 15° to the south to avoid a collision. The captain of the U.S. naval ship responded, saying that he is the captain of a U.S. Navy ship, so he would again advise the Canadians to divert their course. The Canadians say again that the Americans should divert their course.

The Americans responded that they are the American carrier USS *Lincoln*, the second largest ship in the United States Atlantic fleet, and that they were accompanied by destroyers, cruisers and support vessels. They demanded that the Canadians change their course 15° north.

The Canadians responded that they were in a lighthouse, so it was the Americans' call.

Government Orders

The Parliamentary Budget Officer is our lighthouse, and the Liberals have abandoned all of their previous fiscal anchors. It does not matter how large the Prime Minister's ego is, how global his resume is, how many so-called expert bureaucrats he surrounds himself with, or how loudly he insists that the laws of economics will divert 15° any which way to his will. Reality does not move.

The collision course is set, and the warning light is fixed, but the government is refusing to turn. The Prime Minister's capital budgeting framework hides debt by counting spending as an investment. The Prime Minister spent his career on Bay Street, so maybe it is no surprise that he is still cooking books. In the private sector, he called it creative finance. In government, he calls it capital budgeting.

Conservatives know what it is. It is a credit card budget. Canada now has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7, a \$78.3-billion deficit and interest costs of \$55.6 billion annually, which is more than the Canada health transfer and more than the government collects in GST.

Canadians were promised expert prudence. They got more debt. They asked only for honesty and for a government that lives within its means and tells the truth about the books. The Prime Minister campaigned on the promise that we would do things previously thought impossible at speeds we have not seen in generations, but now he warns young Canadians that, because of his failures, we will not transform our economy easily or in a few months, and it will cost sacrifices and take time.

The Prime Minister promised to make life more affordable. Every sign shows the opposite. Food prices are rising nearly 40% faster in Canada than in the U.S. Over 2.1 million Canadians use food banks each and every month, and nearly one in five visitors are employed but still unable to afford food. A few days ago, a friend of mine and his wife went to the grocery store. They set a limit of \$200. As they filled their cart, he kept his iPhone calculator in hand, adding up the price of every item. By the time they reached \$200, the cart was still nearly empty. It was a few basics, no luxuries, and the bill was already full.

That is the reality for families across the country today. Not long ago, that same \$200 would have filled the cart to the top. Most Canadians remember it well, before the Liberal lost decade hollowed out the dollar and drove up the cost of everything. While Canadians count every dollar in the checkout line, the Prime Minister pretends to understand their struggle. He may stage his photo ops in grocery aisles, but let us be honest: He is not the one doing the shopping. The global elite, as he refers to himself, do not push their own carts or calculate the cost of milk.

• (1200)

This budget would make food even more expensive. The industrial carbon tax hits farmers and agri-food on fertilizer, machinery and manufacturing costs. The Liberal fuel standard adds a 17¢-per-litre cost to the price of diesel and gasoline. The Liberal packaging tax adds billions throughout the food supply chain. Food inflation is now so severe that Food Banks Canada gave the Prime Minister an F on poverty and food insecurity. Canadians do not need to settle for this. They remember a time when a fair wage meant a full gro-

cery cart, when the government lived within its means and when ordinary people could afford an ordinary life.

The government said it would build more homes and bring prices down. Instead, housing starts have collapsed 17%, mortgage payments are up two-thirds since 2020, builders are cutting staff and young Canadians with full-time jobs are being told to rent for life.

Canada is expected to rank second worst in the OECD for per capita growth from 2025 to 2030. Investment per worker has fallen 10%, while in the United States, it has risen by 22%.

The Prime Minister said he would spend less and invest more, but what did we get? We got higher spending, lower investment and a larger deficit. Families now pay the price each time they buy food, renew a mortgage or watch their children give up on home ownership dreams.

The new capital budgeting framework was sold as innovation, but was called “overly expansive” and referred to as exceeding international practice by the Parliamentary Budget Officer. It counts subsidies and housing programs as assets. Imagine that. It turns spending into investment and shrinks the deficit on paper, while our deficit and debt keep rising. This pattern defines the government's record.

The Prime Minister promised discipline, but has increased spending by 8% since taking office. He promised transparency, but delayed the public accounts past its legal deadline. He promised a falling debt-to-GDP ratio, yet the PBO confirms it is climbing for the first time in 30 years.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has done his duty and warned that this path cannot continue. It is Parliament's responsibility to divert its course.

Behind every number is a life that's made harder. The over two million food bank visits in March are not statistics; they are families choosing between groceries and rent, seniors skipping meals for medicine and parents working extra shifts so their children can eat.

Housing shows the same decline. The government's own agency warns that homebuilding will drop 13% over the next three years. Mortgage rates have reached heights not seen in recent years, builders are cutting staff and couples who might have built families are being forced to wait.

Farmers who feed the nation carry the industrial carbon tax on fertilizer and machinery, the 17¢ Liberal fuel standard and the billion-dollar packaging tax that adds billions to the food chain. These measures have made Canadian food unaffordable.

Canadians deserve a government that treats public money as a trust. The Conservative vision begins with restraint and the discipline to live within our means and spend for the good of everyday Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has already warned the government that its fiscal path is unsustainable, and that borrowing will exceed statutory limits by year-end 2026-27. No government has the right to hand a country steeped in debt to its children and grandchildren.

The Conservative plan begins with one rule: Every new dollar of spending must be matched by a dollar saved. Waste in bureaucracy, consultants and corporate welfare must end before new promises are made.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer reported \$53.9 billion in lost investments since the government took office. We will bring that investment home by rewarding production, by lowering taxes on work, homebuilding and energy, and by unlocking resource development instead of delaying it.

Taxation must again be fair. Families should not bear the cost of a government that spends for political gains. Ending the industrial carbon tax, the Liberal clean fuel standard of 17¢ a litre and the \$1-billion packaging tax will lift the burden on farmers, manufacturers, families and, ultimately, all Canadian households. If the government will not divert its course, the opposition will.

A budget that puts Canadians first by telling the truth and respecting taxpayers is not an ambition; it is our responsibility to the Canadian people.

• (1205)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my friend from Provencher and I do good work together on the industry committee. It is a committee that is fundamentally charged with economic growth.

He referred to a number of matters. I want to talk about economic growth and ask him about some of the measures in this budget bill that would spur economic growth.

I am particularly interested in his views on some of the Manitoba-focused investments and plans. Two come to mind that I understand might be of interest to him. These are the announcement of the intention to expand free trade discussions with India and the inclusion of the port of Churchill in our plans for infrastructure expansion.

I want to know the hon. member's comments on those issues.

Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a fellow member of the industry committee, where we talk about economic growth.

Government Orders

The first question he asked was about expanding our conversations with India. We know what that has done so far. It has resulted in an increased tariff on our yellow pea products that we have been sending to India.

Whenever the Prime Minister travels abroad anywhere, Canadians get nothing substantial in return, other than higher tariffs or restrictions and barriers to access into other markets, while they continue to ship their products into Canada. Take beef and pork from the United Kingdom as an example. When the Prime Minister visited, we received nothing out of a deal except a 150% increase in U.K. imports into Canada on agricultural products.

Does the member want me to address the issue of Churchill? No. Okay.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have been asking a few questions about what is not in the budget.

One thing that is missing from the budget is the \$814 million that the Bloc Québécois was calling for. We wanted that money to be returned to Quebecers following the spring rebate on a carbon tax that had never been paid. Cheques totalling \$4 billion were sent out across Canada, except to Quebec and British Columbia.

The tax had not been paid, but it was reimbursed anyway. That is not a rebate; that is a gift. On top of that, to pay for the gift, \$814 million of that \$4 billion came from tax dollars paid by Quebecers. That is theft.

Does my colleague agree with me that this \$814 million should have been reimbursed to Quebec in the budget?

• (1210)

[*English*]

Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Bloc raises a very important question about what is missing in the budget. There is a lot missing in the budget. What is missing is a pathway for young couples and families in Canada to be able to afford to build a house. Home ownership is missing.

Further to the question from my colleague from the other side about Churchill, there is another hollow promise in the budget that an all-weather road to Churchill will be built, but there is no budget allocation line for that kind of thing.

There are so many things missing in this budget. The member from the Bloc is bang on. There is a lot missing in this budget, and that is why neither his party nor my party can support the budget. There is just too much missing.

Government Orders

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the member worked in the financial industry prior to becoming a member of Parliament. Could he tell the House of Commons what would have happened to him if he had taken an expense or a credit and put it into another column to make it look like there was extra money in the account, instead of money missing? How would a person who worked at his institution be treated after that? What would the consequences be?

Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, to put it quite bluntly, the consequences for an action like that would be immediate termination, which is exactly what should happen with the Liberal government. It should be immediately terminated if it cannot do what Canadians have asked it to do, which is make life more affordable, open up our resources and get our natural resources to tidewater through the use of pipelines and ports of entry.

In the financial world, when the dollars and the cents do not add up and the credits and the debits are not equal, decisions have to be made. The Liberal government has to start making some decisions as well, or Canadians will make that decision for it.

[*Translation*]

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in today's debate on the bill before us, the budget implementation bill. This budget aims to build, empower and protect Canada, as my friend the parliamentary secretary so aptly described.

[*English*]

It is really important to have the context of this budget bill in front of us clear. We have a hinge moment of rupture in our trading relationship with our major trading partner.

We go to our different constituencies on weekends to talk to our constituents and business owners. I was in touch just last night with the business owners of the Baby Point Gates Business Improvement Area. What is on their mind is this rupture moment and how Canada will respond. They are looking for leadership, frankly, from all parties to respond to this moment.

As my friend and fellow parliamentary secretary mentioned, this budget does a really good job of making the key investments that would help us with this transition and help us respond to this hinge moment and this rupture we are experiencing today. There are some concrete investments in the long term.

Some of those investments are in the people who have been asking for support for some time. They are the people who put themselves on the line for our sovereignty and our freedom. I am thinking in particular of one of the single biggest major investments in this budget, which is the salary increase for the women and men who serve in our armed forces. Past governments were not as attentive to this as they needed to be. Canadians and the armed forces have said they need to be invested in. They need to be the people who are trusted to continue to defend Canada, whether at home or abroad, with some real recognition and some real investment.

This budget makes a really significant and important commitment to those people. It was unfortunate to see our friends on the other side, who have often spoken about the value of the Canadian

military and military service, vote against that, but it was very important that we put that in the budget.

There are also tax measures to support the people who have needed it the most. I want to refer to a couple of them. The personal support worker health care heroes tax credit is a really important commitment that was made by our party in our manifesto. We hear every day about the back-breaking physical labour, often done by women, immigrants and newcomers.

In my riding of Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, the Tibetan Canadian community, often trained in health care professions, works as personal support workers for Copernicus Lodge at the different health care sites. Some are in the riding and some very far from the riding. These are people who put everything on the line for the people they care about, their clients and their patients, who are the most vulnerable in our society, but they are vulnerable too. They often have to work two jobs and go between different places of work. It was especially important that we recognize them.

I think everyone in this House would have recognized that work during the pandemic. After the pandemic, it was too easy for too many to forget about the role of these health care heroes and the representation they got from their union. On this side, we heard the call. I am so pleased to see that in this budget bill, we honour the commitment to the health care heroes tax credit. I just met a couple of days ago with a couple of personal support workers, Vegeta and Ellen, who shared with us the back-breaking work they do and their desire and their need for support.

The tax measures are also for the job creators that bring economic growth to our nation.

The good news about some of these tax measures and investments is that when the money goes directly to the people, we know they are spending the money, so when we make an investment in our military and the lowest-paid members of our services, we know they are going to use that money to buy goods and services in their community.

Some of the tax measures to build Canada, as my friend, the parliamentary secretary mentioned, are for our job creators. I am thinking in particular of the refinements to the SR and ED tax credit. This is of major interest and major use to so many small and medium-sized businesses in our communities.

• (1215)

Recently I met a constituent, Brad McCabe, who told me that the tax credit, while good policy, was not working as well as it could be. It was taking too long for people to find out about this tax credit and whether they would be eligible. As a result, the investments Mr. McCabe was making in his business were not being recognized by the government.

We therefore made the proposed change in the budget bill to move to pre-approval so investors have the certainty of knowing that there would be a recognition of their investment with a tax credit. We also proposed compressing the timeline so people would be able to find out about and receive the money in a more timely fashion. It is an important tax measure in the budget to support Canadians.

There is another part of the budget bill I want to highlight that I think is important to many members in southern Ontario and Quebec. It has been much talked about, and now we have some government action that is starting to move the needle. I am talking about the measures in the budget bill around high-speed rail. We know that the Alto project is a very exciting project that Canadians have been talking about for decades. There are some really specific and concrete measures in the budget bill that would bring forward the work, along with the commitment to reduce the timelines around the assessment of the project from eight years to four years.

This is something that people throughout southern Ontario and Quebec have been looking for. They have been saying that it is a really key part of our growth and connectivity as a country. My hon. friend from Peterborough knows how important this is. We talk about it as a Toronto to Quebec City corridor, but there are major places along the way that could also stand to really benefit from it. In this moment when it is so easy to be divided and for Canadians to be pitted against each other, it is a very important measure that in the budget bill we have some investments that are intentionally about connecting Canadians.

As parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry, I cannot help but point out that there are some very important investments in science and research in the budget. Other countries are pulling back on science, and even in the general public there is a growing concern or fear that science is not something we should be trusting, that discovery-based research is something for someone else, and that the really important work of diversity, equity and inclusion in science and research is something to be rejected. When this is happening, I am really proud to be associated with a government that stands wholeheartedly in support of inquiry in the hard sciences, the life sciences and the social sciences and humanities.

The current budget is the second of two historic budgets for science and research work and its community and therefore for the economic benefit that will come from that. In our 2024 budget, we brought forward major investments in the three major granting councils. Those are the agencies that fund the research done by our professors, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, which in turn generates the life-saving and economic innovations we are all so lucky to benefit from.

In the current budget, there is a major new commitment around attracting international talent and identifying the best minds, the

Government Orders

people who are looking to do science and are being told frankly in their country that it may not be the place for them to do science, that it is going to cut funding, that it does not like their political views or that what they are doing is political.

On our side of the aisle and in the budget, we very clearly recognize that work done in teams in pursuit of excellence and scientific inquiry is the kind of work we want to do in Canada. The budget makes a major investment in this, and we are looking for Canadians in Canada and people all around the world to be looking forward to this international talent attraction strategy. I am so proud to be associated with it.

I was at the Canadian Science Policy Conference last year, and the academic community from coast to coast in Canada has been raving about how well supported it feels. Its members are feeling more patriotic than ever, and they know that when we invest in science and research and in open-ended inquiry in the hard sciences, the life sciences and the social sciences and humanities, it is not just about the research; it is actually about sovereignty and freedom for Canada. They depend on a certain level of sovereignty and freedom to do their work, and in turn they generate sovereignty, freedom and economic benefit for all of us.

These are just some of the benefits of the budget that I am proud to point out today, and I look forward to questions and comments.

• (1220)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our colleague mentioned health care workers and our frontline workers, who, as he has said, seem to have been forgotten since COVID. He is new to the House and to Parliament, so perhaps he does not know the work I have done over the last 10 years in standing up for the people who stand up for us, save us and are there to heal us.

There is a bill before us, Bill S-233, that is the exact version of my bill that passed unanimously last Parliament and passed unanimously in the Senate but fell off the Order Paper because of the dissolution of Parliament. I wonder if the member would support a unanimous consent motion to have Bill S-233 pass at all levels so we can send a message to the people who stand up for us that violence is not part of their job description.

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. member speak in the House about people in emergency services and health care workers, and I appreciate learning more about that specific bill. When it comes to unanimous consent, I know there will be many voices that will be involved.

I also know we have in front of us Bill C-14, which is a really important bill before the House that we were working hard to pass. I believe it incorporates many of the things the hon. member is talking about.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my Liberal colleague is talking about what he sees in the budget, but as we have said repeatedly, let us talk about what is missing from the budget.

Personally, I would like to talk about public servants. The northern bonuses are being eliminated. In some regions like mine, there is no succession in the public service, which means that some positions are not being filled. This prevents public servants from advancing their career and it leads to excessive workloads. What is more, a new pay system is on the way.

The government is also reducing public service pension plans, when in fact this is money that has been deferred. It is a salary that has been negotiated, so they are playing with collective agreements. We are talking about 40,000 jobs lost, and 15% in operating costs where cuts are being made.

How is that good news for regions like mine? I would like my colleague to respond directly to the people of my riding and tell them how any of this is good for the people back home.

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Speaker, I get these questions from time to time. I understand that my colleague has public service workers in her riding. I have them in my riding as well. Toronto may be the capital of Ontario, but there are also federal public servants in my riding.

I also want to commend the work of the public service employees who prepared and published this budget. The bill presented here for our consideration and the work that is being done rests on the shoulders of public service workers.

To answer my colleague's question, our plan is laid out in the budget. In my view, this was done with a lot of planning and it took many years to create and implement this plan.

• (1225)

[English]

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member did mention health care workers, and the tax credit's being applied to personal support workers. It is something I have advocated for.

I would like to just find out from the member why he thought this was important and what kind of changes it will bring. I know the Conservatives brought this up as an issue. Why would they vote against something like this?

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague, in his work in Scarborough—Woburn and previously in provincial government, has been a long-time champion of public workers and workers who have a lower income but who do the most essential work of caregiving. The tax credit will return over \$1,000 annually to the pockets of personal support workers and those who qualify.

I think that is a really important affordability measure, but it is also really important recognition, as the workers it applies to are typically working multiple jobs in provincially regulated settings or in private ones. We did it in a fiscally responsible way, for those who are looking at the budget tables. It was really quite unfortunate that the—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes.

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we take the time to discuss, to analyze and to review what the government's spending priorities are and that we put it in the context of what Canadians' priorities are. What does Canada need?

There is an old saying, wishing someone a blessing that they might live in interesting times. Some say that it is perhaps a curse and not a blessing, but we certainly do live in interesting times. Having had the privilege, the honour and the duty to represent my community in this place for coming on seven years now, I have seen the effects of the changing global, national and regional dynamics on my community.

The beautiful riding of Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes comprises 13 municipalities. It is a collection of stories of families and of neighbours, people who are the true essence of this wonderful country, the greatest country in the world, Canada. Like so many other people, they have forged their livelihood, forged a living, forged a community and are raising a family, having broken the ground and fed the the nation and the world with the products they produce.

It has never been for lack of ingenuity, effort or wherewithal that hard times have fallen on my community. Its people have an incredibly collaborative spirit, always looking to work together, and they are committed to lifting up the least among us. I truly think that the measure of a good, just and fair society is how we treat the least among us. How are we doing with that? As I said, the efforts that people in my community have put forward have been laudable, and I am incredibly proud of the work they undertake, but what I hear consistently from them is that the cost of government so far outpaces what we are able to afford.

Is that to say that everything government, or the current government, does is bad? Well, not everything is. There is the continuation of programs that have been developed in consultation with generations of Canadians that continue to be funded and that are important.

Could we do better with the allocations that are being made? Yes, we could. While that is true of all governments, none being perfect, what we see in the current budget is an awful lot of debt and deficit spending that are really beyond the ability of Canadians to manage. The amount that we are spending on servicing the debt is more than we are spending on health care, which is something I hear about in my community often.

What is the federal government doing in terms of resolving the health care human resource challenge we have? How much money is it allocating in health transfers to the provinces? What specific measures is it taking to solve the lack of access to a doctor or other health care professional?

Government Orders

● (1230)

It is important, as the official opposition, that we oppose; it is our role, and it is an imperative in our system. However, we must also propose. I encourage the government, as it seeks passage of legislation, to meaningfully consult with the opposition. There is a lot that ties us together. There is more that we all have in common in this country than we would disagree on, so why not have those consultations?

Why not take a look at the proposal the Leader of the Opposition put forward in the election on credential recognition, on having one system across Canada for personal support workers, RPNs, RNs, NPs and MDs in which their recognition, licensure and credentials are recognized across the board. Let us straighten that out. It should be the same for folks coming from abroad who want to bring their skills, talents and credentials to Canada to help solve our health care human resource challenge. That is one example of many in which we can offer constructive solutions to the government and look for it to collaborate with us on that.

Every dollar the government spends comes from somewhere. It is coming from the pockets of Canadians. We would say that some of that should stay in their pockets. Now, how do we do that? We encouraged the government to cap the deficit and to do more on cutting taxes. Again, we are not just opposing legislation put forward by the government on reduction of taxes, on making sure that we are able to work as one Canadian economy. I voted for that. I would not just blindly oppose what the government puts forward, but I do look for those constructive conversations on such things as capping the deficit and cutting taxes.

Where can the government save money? As soon as we talk about saving money, the cries go up that it is going to mean cuts to important services for Canadians. Let us look at such things as the more than \$20 billion a year that is being spent on consultants. Is every dollar spent on consultants a waste? I would not say every dollar is, but I would say it is more than \$1 billion, more than \$10 billion. That is what the government needs to look at. It was exposed and laid bare with the arrive scam and with fraud in indigenous procurement, with companies claiming to have indigenous status or eligibility when they did not. That is one concrete example. My goodness, \$20 billion would go a long way to solving much of what ails our country and could be used to support our community.

We need constructive conversations. We need a government that cares about our trading relationship. My community has two international bridges to the United States, our largest trading partner. More than 100 jobs from Invista, in Maitland, Ontario are going across those bridges down to Texas. Dozens of jobs at Douglas Barwick have been lost because of steel tariffs. Let us have those conversations. We need that collaboration.

We need a government that is working with the opposition to adopt some of the priorities we have put forward. The people in my community, like Canadians from coast to coast to coast, need a government that cares. I am offering that. I have offered that in my seven years of service, and I will continue to do that, as will my Conservative colleagues. I look forward to members' questions.

● (1235)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have actually had the opportunity to sit through a lot of the debate on Bill C-15, and I will say that this is probably one of the best Conservative speeches that I have heard today.

To the members' point, he is actually proposing some stuff. He has made suggestions, and he has acknowledged the fact that, yes, it is important not just to obstruct and to prevent, but to actually offer solutions. Maybe he should be the Leader of the Conservative Party, because we never hear that from the member for Battle River—Crowfoot, the Leader of the Opposition. Members should not take my word for it; they can just watch question period. We never get such proposals from the Leader of the Opposition, not even when he meets one-on-one with the Prime Minister.

Can the member explain why we are not hearing that from the leadership—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes.

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, I am always happy to give credit when something goes poorly and take credit when something goes well.

In this case, as all hon. members are, I will be transparently honest. In terms of the good ideas I have brought forward today, these propositions, I am incredibly proud to say that the member for Battle River—Crowfoot, the leader of Canada's Conservative Party, platformed them, put them forward and offered them in a letter to the Prime Minister with respect to, for example, the size of the deficit or solutions for health care credential recognition. Therefore, we are going to continue offering those concrete solutions, and we look forward to constructive discussions with the government to implement them.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member talked a lot about some of the needs in health care and how the budget fails to address them. He talked about credential recognition. Could he also expand briefly on how the amount of interest that we are going to be paying on the ever-accumulating debt of the Liberal government is going to negatively impact our ability to do what he suggests?

Government Orders

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, the preliminary figures show that the Liberal government is saddling every Canadian family with \$20,000 in debt. With thousands of dollars per year in reduced spending power for Canadians, with rising inflation and increased taxes, this creates negative pressure at a time when we are seeing food prices rise 40% faster in Canada than in the United States. That is why it is so important to cap the deficit spending every year, set real priorities that address the concerns that Canadians have today and be very disciplined in what the government is seeking to do.

If the Liberals want to be good at everything, they are going to be good at nothing. We need to get good at delivering on the priorities that Canadians have outlined for us. Some of those things include nation-building projects, such as getting a pipeline built from east to west in this country and making sure that, when they are not feeling well, or so that they do not feel unwell, Canadians can see a doctor.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there are a lot of measures in the budget, but there are also a lot of things missing, especially when it comes to the forestry sector.

From back home in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, to the north shore, to Abitibi, the forestry industry all across Quebec is really hurting. The government is not delivering help. There is no help in the budget, even though there are solutions out there. Announcements were made just yesterday, but they are not good enough for the industry because they are not in line with what it needs. One thing the industry wants is for the government to cover 50% of the countervailing duties until the crisis is resolved.

I would like to hear my colleague's comments on what the government plans to do in its budget and on why it is failing to resolve situations that persist in Quebec.

[*English*]

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, the forestry sector is incredibly important to this country and to my family. My dad worked in the business for his career and provided for our family. That should be an opportunity for generations to come. The government needs to continue to make sure it is challenging any illegal trade actions or illegal tariffs against our softwood lumber sector.

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a member of Parliament for a rural Alberta riding, and as someone who spent 26 years as a chartered professional accountant before coming to this place, I feel obligated to rise today to speak to Bill C-15 and to the government's latest disaster of a federal budget.

I am going to dive into some of the fiscal details of the budget, but I want to be clear from the start: After 10 years of the Liberals, Canadians cannot afford the cost of the Prime Minister. They cannot afford the cost of his deficits; they cannot afford the cost of his broken promises, and they cannot afford the growing cost to simply feed their families. This budget does not build a stronger Canada. It mortgages our future and leaves rural communities, such as the ones I represent, behind.

I spent more than two decades reviewing financial statements, and I have seen business families thrive, but I have also seen them struggle. When I look at the budget, one thing is obvious: In the business world, the government would never secure financing on this record.

Let us remember what the Prime Minister promised Canadians six months ago. He promised a deficit at \$62 billion, but it is at \$73.8 billion. He promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio; instead, it is rising. That is another miss. He promised to spend less, but he is spending \$90 billion more, which amounts to \$5,400 in new inflationary spending per household. He promised more investment, yet investments in Canada are collapsing.

These are not minor errors. These are fundamental failures in fiscal stewardship, and they are costing Canadians every day. That is the cost of the Liberal government.

Tourism is the heartbeat of many rural Alberta communities, especially in my riding of Yellowhead. With the natural beauty of Banff National Park and Jasper National Park, to the welcoming communities of Canmore and Grande Cache, our local festivals, rodeos, campgrounds, trails and small businesses employ over 8,700 workers in my riding. Moreover, 2,259 businesses in Yellowhead are tourism-related.

Tourism has proven to be one of the best returns on investment that a country can make, with research showing an up to 12-fold return for every dollar invested in tourism. I was appalled to see that the budget absolutely ignored our tourism sector. Rural operators are struggling with higher costs, labour shortages and shrinking margins. They are fighting just to stay open. The federal government had a chance to support them, and it chose not to. That decision puts real jobs, families and communities at risk.

Another area I was hoping to see addressed in the budget is regarding indigenous policing. I have been privileged to sit on the indigenous and northern affairs committee. We have heard again and again, week after week, that the government needs to step up and adequately fund indigenous policing in Canada. The lack of consistent, reliable funding is continuing to have an impact on public safety in these communities.

I believe the government really missed the mark when it comes to not including dedicated funding where it is sorely needed. This is a profound failure. Rural Albertans know this well. My communities rely on underfunded RCMP detachments that are already stretched thin. Indigenous communities deserve equitable public safety and should be supporting first nations policing, not ignoring it.

As a rural Albertan, a legal firearm owner and a hunter who has been a responsible gun owner my entire life, I need to address the impacts the bill would have on law-abiding firearms owners. What Ottawa is calling a buyback is not a safety measure. It feels as though the government does not understand our way of life, and it is reaching into our homes and taking property when we have already followed all the rules. Gun owners are licensed and trained, and we follow storage and transport requirements because we believe in safety.

However, the budget continues to pour millions of dollars into confiscating legally purchase firearms instead of putting resources where they actually make a difference, such as border enforcement, rural policing and indigenous policing, as I have already mentioned, and the government needs to address the root causes of crime. Bill C-15 punishes people who did nothing wrong while real problems go untouched.

For those of us who hunt to fill our freezers, who pass down traditions to our children and who treat firearms with respect, this is not just a policy disagreement. It is a sign that our voices and realities are being ignored. We deserve laws that target criminals, not citizens who follow the law.

● (1245)

I want to address another issue that, as a CPA for 26 years, is especially troubling to me: the government moving forward on automatic tax filing. Let me be clear. Conservatives support making life easier for Canadians. We support simplicity, efficiency and fairness, but automatic tax filing is not about making life easier. It is about giving the CRA the power to assess people's taxes for them without ensuring they get the benefits, deductions and credits they are entitled to.

The Auditor General reported that when people are able to get through on the phone, the CRA gives wrong information more often than not. Many Canadians already face reassessments and incorrect notices. It is naive to believe that adding another automatic system would improve in any way the service Canadians receive from the CRA. My expectation is that this change will only cause more confusion, more frustration and more phone calls to an already drowning phone line. Under automatic filing, the CRA would become both the tax preparer and the auditor. This is not service and it is not simplification; this is a conflict of interest. Seniors, low-income families and rural citizens would be the ones most likely to lose the benefits they should receive.

When the CRA makes a mistake, who do Canadians appeal to? We already have a system where someone is guilty until they can prove otherwise with the CRA. With this change, Canadians would need to appeal to the same agency that made the mistake, and likely months after the fact. As someone who has spent a career helping people navigate the tax system, I cannot support a policy that would put vulnerable Canadians at risk of overpayment and missed benefits. This is a system that would put government convenience ahead of citizens' rights.

I spent my career studying numbers behind government decisions and the impacts those decisions have on Canadians and their businesses. I can tell members this: Too often, Liberals have lacked the vision to see what happens with the changes they make. For ex-

Government Orders

ample, the changes to bare trust reporting that were supposed to be implemented for March 2024 were meant to go after so-called rich people, but they cast a wide net affecting millions of ordinary Canadians. At the eleventh hour, after thousands of accounting hours, the Liberals cancelled the implementation because it would have had unintended consequences.

In the last few days, several Liberals have admitted to the cancellation of the UHT, or underused housing tax, which also had unintended consequences. They eliminated that fiasco. The UHT was supposed to target foreign speculation, yet it swept up millions of Canadians into unreasonable reporting requirements for no good. Once again, red tape for poorly thought-out legislation added layers of half-formed regulations and burdens. I can only say that thank goodness someone saw the light on this Liberal failure.

My fear is that this disastrous budget would not create prosperity, just financial strain on our constituents and future generations. The Liberals discourage growth, punish taxpayers and add complexity to a system already strained to the breaking point. What Canadians need is a tax framework that rewards work and supports Canadians.

After I listened to Canadians in my riding, my conclusion was simple: This budget fails the people it is supposed to support. Rural communities asked for affordability, for safety, for opportunity and for respect. Instead, they would be handed higher costs, more bureaucracy and a government that continues to ignore the realities outside major cities.

The Conservatives continue fighting for a government that lives within its means and respects taxpayers. We will push for a tax system that is fair, a regulatory system that makes sense and a budget that puts families, farmers, workers and small businesses first. Canadians deserve better, and the Liberal budget does nothing but disappoint.

● (1250)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the member has so much bias against the CRA. The CRA, if we do a comparison, is probably in the top two or three revenue agencies in the world given the fine work that civil servants do within the CRA.

Government Orders

The member took great lengths to be critical of the CRA's program to enable automatic tax filing. Nothing would prevent an individual from filing their own taxes. What the member fails to recognize is that there are literally thousands of individuals who would benefit by having the CRA do this. There are literally hundreds of people in Canada who try to encourage others to file. Allowing this to take place is a great benefit to communities.

William Stevenson: Mr. Speaker, I have spent many hours on hold with the CRA. I have had a lot of frustration with the number of people reading off a checklist who have inadequate answers to the questions we go through. Even when we write the CRA, we do not always get the right answer.

I am sorry the member feels that I have little respect for the CRA, but I have experienced, for a long time, a lot of frustration.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, the Bloc Québécois voted against this budget and will be voting against its implementation.

I listened closely to every word my colleague said. There is something I have been wondering about from the start. We have been hearing a lot about how this budget wastes public money and does not spend it on the right things. For example, the government just extended tax credits for oil and gas companies from 2035 to 2040. Those tax credits were costing us all \$83 billion, but now they will cost us up to \$100 billion for an industry that logs record-breaking profits year after year.

Does my colleague see this as a prime example of wasting money?

[*English*]

William Stevenson: Mr. Speaker, one thing that I find the government is supposed to do, as far as when I got into this goes, is help people out. Usually, helping out businesses to be profitable and give good jobs means making a good environment in our country for them to make profit.

We are falling behind when we compare ourselves to the U.S. There are different tax credits. We had the 100% expensing of certain items for businesses, but that has been reversed. We are falling behind, so we have to look at how we are going to make ourselves more competitive in this world against our fellows to the south. That is a very important part of this that we have to deal with when we are looking at how the tax code affects all businesses.

• (1255)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one thing I have been hearing from my riding that I have not heard yet in this debate concerns the Canada pension plan and the fact that the government, in the budget, has listed it as a government asset. That is the money of Canadians. Canadians and their employers have paid into it. It is not a government asset. I am very concerned, as they are, that the government will feel it is its money to spend.

Could the member comment on that?

William Stevenson: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the government is not operating with the same fiscal framework that business-

es are required to when they deal with the CRA for their taxes. They could never account for a liability as an asset, yet the government has done that.

There have been a lot of changes to the CPP over the last few years that have made two different levels and added more burdens when it comes to the taxpayer, both businesses and individuals. The changes to the CPP have not necessarily been helpful in regard to what is going to benefit the program in the long term. The Liberals have made it so it is going to last, but they have made it expensive. That is the problem.

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to represent the good people of Abbotsford—South Langley, who are frustrated with the current budget.

When the Prime Minister announced that he would be splitting operating and capital spending in the budget, it was met with widespread worry that he would use the change to cook the books. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has now confirmed that is exactly what is happening. The Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that capital spending is “overly expansive”, expanding beyond the public accounts and international practice. Instead of following international accounting standards, the Prime Minister lumped it into corporate tax breaks and subsidies that “would not be considered capital formation”.

Also, the PBO found that capital investment spending was 30% lower than what the Liberals claimed, a \$94-billion difference. He found that the Prime Minister will not balance the operating budget over the next five years, abandoning key fiscal anchors after already abandoning the previous one to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio. The PBO found that the debt-to-GDP ratio will be even higher after the latest economic update, which means we are already on a declining trend.

Last year's fall economic statement stated a declining debt-to-GDP ratio was key to preserving Canada's AAA credit rating, but even Fitch Ratings has already warned that the budget “underscores the erosion of federal government's finances”. The Prime Minister fumbled the old fiscal anchor with a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio.

Even the so-called expenditure review notes there is a “lack of detail regarding the impact on individual programs”, offering no clarity on service levels, personnel or how results will be reported. Even if the budget somehow produced \$50 billion in savings, it still has a \$90-billion net increase in spending. That is \$5,400 per Canadian family. For the second year in a row, the Liberals failed to table the public accounts for more than seven months after the fiscal year ended.

Government Orders

Canada remembers when the last minister of finance resigned in disgrace over the deficit. Why did the government celebrate the deficit of over \$70 billion? Canadians cannot afford baby formula and are facing precarious housing, yet the government abuses their tax dollars further under the guise of shrewd investment. Investment has become a buzzword and is used to ignore the rising inflation of the government.

When facing such economic turmoil, the solution is to remedy the productivity crisis. We should not bury Canadians in more red tape. Instead of investing in a bureaucratic mess of weak government-led projects, why do the Liberals not allow Canadians to operate their businesses as they have done before? Our fishing industry, forestry industry, military, and health care sectors are all facing major setbacks because the Liberals are too preoccupied studying their own systems into failure. The cost of this budget is pushing Canadians out of this country and into the United States.

At the same time, the areas that actually need help are left behind. These areas are facing crises. We are facing the largest drug crisis in the history of Canada, but budget 2025 remains blissfully ignorant. Cutting funding to those who are most vulnerable will only make the opioid crisis cost more lives and our cities more unsafe.

Our federal debt has reached over \$1.28 trillion. That is \$1,280 billion, which is incomprehensibly large to the average Canadian. Canada will be spending \$54 billion just to service the debt, which is equal to federal health transfers. Servicing the debt is now a core government function, yet money is still wasted on vanity projects such as the gun grab, which will not remedy public safety.

• (1300)

Over 10 years, we have witnessed budget after budget with ballooning deficits. The prime minister who presented them resigned. The man who replaced him told Canadians that he would be a reasonable guy who was more fiscally responsible. With his first, late, budget, he is not the man he said he was.

With a projected deficit of \$78.3 billion, this budget gets us nowhere close to balance. It is especially hard to achieve balance or strike any meaningful deal with the President of the United States when the Prime Minister is burning hundreds of thousands of dollars on photo op travels instead of doing real work for Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has indicated that the GDP growth is stagnant and will remain below 2% for the decade, making rising debt levels unmanageable.

The new finance minister has now presented a budget that will grow our debt-to-GDP ratio rather than shrink it. Budget 2025 boldly claims to have the most ambitious housing plan since the Second World War, yet Canadians today face a housing crisis that is, by many measures, worse than that of 1945. Government-imposed costs, fees, taxes and delays are making up to 30% to 50% of new housing prices. I will repeat again that government-imposed costs, fees, taxes and delays are making up to 30% to 50% of new housing prices.

CMHC now warns that red tape is one of the biggest barriers to building homes. Canada builds fewer homes now than it did back in 1970, despite having the fastest population growth in half a century. Instead of clearing the way for builders, as previous generations

did, the government layers on more bureaucracy and calls it ambition. The Prime Minister promised to cut development charges in half, but budget 2025 says nothing about that. He promised to incentivize private rental construction, but budget 2025 still has nothing. The first six Build Canada Homes projects have failed. Meanwhile, CMHC says Canada needs 480,000 homes a year for 10 years. We are not even close to 200,000. Young Canadians delay having families, careers and life itself because they cannot afford homes or find an affordable house as it is. It is not the Canada that we want to leave to them.

Budget 2025 fails all Canadians who believed in the Prime Minister when he promised to build at scale. Young Canadians deserve a government that works as hard as they do, one that cuts red tape, empowers builders and focuses on getting more homes built. Budget 2025 does not meet that moment. It fails an entire generation. Mark Carney told Canadians that he was a serious—

• (1305)

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind the member again that he cannot use the name of the Prime Minister in the House.

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

The Prime Minister told Canadians that he was a serious economist who would be trusted to spend less and invest more. Instead, his budget reveals less while costing Canadians more with the biggest deficit. We cannot afford the costly Prime Minister.

Conservatives will continue to hold the Liberals to account for breaking their commitments and fight to restore Canada's promise. In a country where Canadians work hard, they deserve a home with a yard and food on the dining table under a proud Canadian flag.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Prime Minister was elected eight months ago with a new government, and we are aggressively pursuing the building of homes. We are working with provinces, municipalities, other stakeholders and the private industry to get more homes built, and we will see that materialize.

Government Orders

The member also talked about the deficit. The reality is that Canada, compared to other G7 countries on a per capita basis, is number one in overall debt. We are number two in the deficit of all the G7 countries, countries such as Germany, Italy, the EU and the United States. We are managing the economy exceptionally well.

Maybe the member could explain why the Conservative Party is so reluctant to invest in Canadians.

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that this is the same Liberal government that has been leading for the past decade, causing Canadians' lives to get worse. There are so many Canadians lined up at food banks who are struggling today. It might be a new Prime Minister, but it is the same government. It is just a new face. We encourage this so-called new government to take ideas from our Conservative Party to make sure Canadians can afford to live.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was in Alberta, where he announced federal approval for the pipeline project that crosses British Columbia and terminates at a deep-water port on the Pacific coast.

Yesterday, the Bloc Québécois asked the government a question, and the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons spontaneously answered yes to that question. The question was whether this project would get approval from the British Columbia government, first nations and the population—whether it would get social licence. He spontaneously replied that it would not go ahead without the approval of the British Columbia government, first nations and the public. However, it is clear that the British Columbia government is not interested in this project. It is against it.

My colleague is from British Columbia. What does he think will happen in his province?

[*English*]

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that British Columbians want a pipeline. They need it. They have been asking for it and are demanding it. The Prime Minister and the Premier of B.C. have their own ties going on right now. It is unfortunate they are not listening to British Columbians. They are not being the voice and the representation this country needs and the province needs.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleague from British Columbia is an excellent addition to this place. I remember criticizing Bill Morneau when he was the minister of finance and they crossed the threshold of \$1 trillion in debt. Fast-forward to several ministers since then, and we are now approaching well over \$2 trillion.

Is the member concerned about the fact that the Prime Minister said he would spend less, and is now spending more money than what Justin Trudeau had in mind last year at this time?

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague knows that our country has been worse off for the past 10 years under the Liberal government. We need new leadership. We need a new government. This is something the Conservative Party is bringing forward, which would actually make sure we can bring a real impact to our economy here and be a good change for Canadians. Our Conservative team is working hard at making sure we can serve Canadians in the right way.

• (1310)

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of talk about pipelines, certainly from the Liberals talking about working with first nations. However, after the fact, they are not consulting with first nations. We have seen that again today. I know the Conservative side is asking the Prime Minister to work directly with provinces to push pipelines through, without the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous people.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague believes in the right to free, prior and informed consent.

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to listen to Canadians. We need to listen to what Canadians are saying today and what their needs are. I know we have talked about pipelines going directly from Alberta to B.C. and about what Canadians are seeing in those two provinces. We need pipelines, and we need to make sure we listen to what Canadians are saying to fill the demands.

Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 meets an important moment in our country's history. It is a budget that bets on Canada, a budget that invests in our future and ensures that we will build a strong and resilient future. The challenge before us is to become less reliant on our trade partners to the south and to build from within.

I would like to start off by talking about one of my favourite words in the English language, which is “infrastructure”. I would also like to congratulate the Victoria Highland Civic Centre steering committee on its advocacy and work to ensure that a new rink will be built in Baddeck if the 2025 budget passes. The community has been sorely lacking over the past year with a rink that had been eroded to the point that it was no longer safe. During my campaign in the spring, I heard from many in Victoria, and especially in Baddeck, about how devastating the loss of the rink was to the community and what we needed to do to get a rink for the community for the local youth hockey program. It fills me with great joy to be able to deliver on this project for them. I want to especially thank the members of the steering committee, John Trickett, Jeanne Campbell, Terry Kelly, David Parkinson and Sandy Campbell for never giving up on the new rink for the community.

This rink is a perfect example of the kind of infrastructure investments our government is making. We now have a build community strong fund with \$51 billion over 10 years, from small local community infrastructure to major infrastructure, such as hospitals, universities, transit, and road and water systems. On this side of the House, we are ready to build great things and keep our economy moving.

Our government is also investing and fast-tracking major projects that will focus on buying Canadian for Canadians. These are projects that are shovel-ready and shovel-worthy and that would advance our climate and reconciliation goals. One project of significance for Cape Breton—Canso—Antigonish is the government's Major Projects Office selection of Wind West Atlantic Energy. Wind West has the potential to power Nova Scotia and beyond with enough clean wind energy to meet our demands into the future. This first phase, with four wind power areas off the coast of Nova Scotia, aims to unlock 5,000 megawatts and could drive billions of new investments in economic activity across the country. Wind West is a project that shows the investment in clean energy does not have to come at the cost of economic development. We can invest in our future while strengthening our economy.

Another major investment we are making is in housing and homes. With the new Build Canada Homes initiative, there is \$13 billion that aims to increase the supply of affordable housing through construction, financing and industry. As we endeavour to build houses faster and in greater numbers, we will build these Canadian homes with Canadian materials, such as lumber, to ensure that we are supporting our local industries from start to finish.

Restoring affordability to homes is important, but we are also working to restore affordability to everyday life. It is clear that the cost of living has increased in Canada, just as it has increased around the world due to climate change, American tariffs and the war in Ukraine. As a G7 country with the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio, we are uniquely positioned to make investments in our future and build a stronger, more resilient country.

Our government is also cutting taxes for 22 million middle-class Canadians, which goes a long way to help the residents of Cape Breton—Canso—Antigonish, and of ridings across Canada, to keep more money in their pockets. At the same time, we remain committed to seniors with our dental care program, committed to families with our affordable child care and the Canada child benefit, and committed to youth with a \$40-million investment in a youth climate corps with green jobs that will help take on the challenges of climate change, not to mention the 175,000 jobs within Canada for the Canada summer jobs program for young Canadians.

We are launching automated federal benefits to ensure that 5.5 million low-income Canadians get the benefits they need without the complicated paperwork. We have also ensured that the children across Canada are not distracted by empty bellies when they are trying to learn by making the national school food program permanent. This program saves money for families and makes sure that no child's hunger is an obstacle to their education.

Budget 2025 continues the important work of advancing reconciliation. Our Prime Minister campaigned on a promise to spend less to invest more, but while other departments were asked to find up to 15% in savings, we knew that we had to protect the core services and programs that we deliver to indigenous Canadians, and that is what we did.

• (1315)

It is not only the right thing to do; it is also our fiduciary responsibility to ensure that we do not take steps backward. We heard from Indigenous people during the budget consultation process not

Government Orders

only that we needed to invest billions in housing, water, waste water and infrastructure in indigenous communities but also that weather-related emergencies are more frequent and that the impacts of climate change required urgent investments. Fires, floods and hurricanes have impacted indigenous communities in great numbers, and we will be there to help them through these difficult times.

We also heard about challenges to our communities, when it came to health and Jordan's principle. That is why we are investing billions to ensure that we address the challenges within Jordan's principle, including addressing the backlog of crises and creating stability moving forward. Budget 2025 allows us to do that.

Unlike budgets in the past that captured indigenous investment on a few pages, the current budget has indigenous investment that is embedded and integrated throughout. It is embedded within the national school food program. It is embedded within the artificial intelligence budget, which can help us digitize indigenous languages moving forward. It is embedded in the projects of national importance that will help us build the strongest economy in the G7 by ensuring that projects advance indigenous interests with meaningful equity, meaningful partnership and meaningful participation.

I have heard the challenges during my lifetime from first nations communities, which have shared with me a great deal about how they are tired of micromanaging poverty. I have good news: Budget 2025 dreams of a future of prosperity for indigenous communities, through major investments in being multi-million-dollar partners in the energy sector, in building trade ports and in mining critical minerals that the world needs.

We invite indigenous nations to dream big and to take advantage of the \$10 billion in the indigenous loans guarantee program and the \$45 billion allocated to the Canada Infrastructure Bank, so indigenous leaders can manage prosperity, not poverty. I would encourage first nations, Métis and Inuit communities to look at the suite of tools available to make investing in major projects more affordable.

Government Orders

For example, last spring in my riding, 12 Mi'kmaq communities formed a limited partnership known as the Wskijnu'k Mtmo'taqnu-uow Agency, WMA, and borrowed \$18 million from the Canada Infrastructure Bank's indigenous equity initiative to invest in a battery storage facility alongside Nova Scotia. The great thing about this is that they get the own-source revenues not only when the project is paid off but also all along the way; as they are making payments, they are able to bring own-source revenues back to their communities.

I have often been asked by Indigenous leaders how they can invest in major projects when the needs are so great in their communities. How can they make payments on million-dollar loans? This is the beauty of the indigenous loan guarantee program. The way it is set up, it works with indigenous stakeholders and communities so loan payments are balanced to maximize benefits to them.

When communities are given the right tools, indigenous leadership drives prosperity and long-term ownership. With the budget our government has presented, we are investing in housing, clean water, health care, connectivity and infrastructure so communities can thrive and prosper. The budget speaks to the north and to working hand in hand with indigenous partners to build a stronger future together.

I invite indigenous leaders to work together, to dream big, to create partnerships and to be partners in major clean energy projects such as the Wind West Atlantic energy project, the Iqaluit hydro project or the Northcliff Resources Sisson mine. Now is the time to build Canada. Let us build prosperity in all our communities.

● (1320)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague spoke a lot about indigenous youth and other Canadian youth. I believe that if he really wanted to help, he would know that Canadian youth are experiencing record-high, 30%, unemployment. He would know that almost everything he has voted for in the government has made things worse for Canadian youth and that Canadian youth, both indigenous and non-indigenous, do not see a future. They do not see an opportunity to own a home, have a great job or get a great education.

Why should anybody believe a word the member says?

Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, when I talk to youth in my riding, they are asking us to invest in a better future. They are asking us to help build Canada, and they want to be a part of this. They want to be part of the trades. They want education. They want our economy to thrive.

Confident countries invest in their communities and in their youth. Confident countries do the work that needs to be done to give those youth a brighter future, and that is what our government is going to continue to do.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just announced that he is approving the construction of a pipeline to transport oil from Alberta, through British Columbia, to the Pacific Ocean. First nations in British Columbia are threatening to take legal action because they disagree with this decision. There is no social licence for it, unlike what my Conservative colleague

said earlier. The Government of British Columbia also disagrees with this move and is considering joining the first nations in taking legal action.

My colleague opposite is a first nations member. Is he taking into account the opinions of British Columbia's first nations on an issue as critical as a pipeline that will cross their land to get to the Pacific Ocean?

How many bitter pills must Liberal government members be able to swallow and how many times will they have to betray their values and principles?

[*English*]

Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite were to read the memorandum of understanding, he would see that what the Prime Minister has agreed to are certain conditions that would allow, potentially, in the future, for a pipeline. Those conditions are predicated on the fact that first nations have full, free, prior and informed consent in the project, and that British Columbia is part of the project.

I am confident that our Prime Minister knows and understands section 35 constitutional rights and knows the conditions required to build in this country. That is why we are advancing indigenous interests, and that is why what we need to do is continue to build but to build in a way that is respectful of all people.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative friends keep saying that the budget spends too much, and whatnot, and that if they were driving the bus, they would have probably taken about \$50 billion to \$60 billion out of the budget. What impact does the hon. member think an austerity budget like that would have on youth?

Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Conservatives wish that Canadians had afforded them the ability to create a budget, but they chose the Liberals. They chose us because of the fact that we invest in them, in our youth and in our country. We believe in building a stronger country for all Canadians. When I knock on doors, not one person ever talks to me about the deficit or the debt. They talk about what our government is able to do.

We are going to continue to deliver for Canadians. That is why we have won four elections in a row.

● (1325)

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was concerned about jurisdictions and consultations, and supposedly about the environment.

What about the electromagnetic forces of the offshore wind turbines that impact marine life, as well as the electromagnetic fields? Are projects like the wind turbines not really about Brookfield? Is prime minister Brookfield not in this for himself?

Government Orders

Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, it was one of the plans of the Conservative Premier of Nova Scotia to ensure that we move forward with wind energy. It is what he asked our government to do, and we delivered on that.

Whatever stripes people have or political parties they belong to, they can agree that clean energy is the best energy for Canada.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to join the debate in this place on behalf of the good people of Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna. This particular debate is noteworthy, and I will explain why.

After 10 years of Liberal budgets under Justin Trudeau, this is the first budget under what the Prime Minister and his cabinet like to call the new Liberal government. Really, who could blame them? We all know that the old Liberal government frequently blew past its budget numbers and ignored its cast-in-stone promise to return to a balanced budget in 2019. The last Trudeau government was a full-on fiscal disaster, so it is no wonder the new Liberal government wants to distance itself as far as possible from the old one.

During the election, we heard the current Prime Minister loud and clear. He promised to spend less. Literally hundreds of times at campaign stops across Canada, he looked Canadians square in the eye and told them that he would “spend less”. Not long ago in this place, in his throne speech, he was sharply critical of the former Trudeau Liberal government for dramatically increasing spending and running large deficits. He condemned it for allowing spending to grow by 9% annually and told us that he would reduce spending growth to under 2%. That was a clear and unequivocal Liberal promise.

[Translation]

What are we seeing in this Liberal budget?

The Prime Minister, who advocated for spending cuts, announced a projected deficit of \$78 billion. To put things in perspective, that is almost double the \$42-billion deficit projected by the previous Trudeau government. I repeat: the Prime Minister who criticized his predecessor for spending too much and who promised Canadians that he would spend less is actually promising to spend twice as much. Honestly, who does that? Who criticizes their predecessor for their excessive spending, gets elected on a promise to spend less and then goes ahead and spends twice as much?

The \$78-billion deficit proposed by the current Prime Minister is the largest in the history of Canada outside a pandemic or global crisis. It is an astronomical figure, no matter how one looks at it.

[English]

That is not all. Budgets, as we know, also outline future spending plans, and here the picture becomes even more alarming. Over the next four fiscal years, the “spend less” Prime Minister is proposing deficits that total roughly \$265 billion. Let us compare that to prime minister Trudeau's last budget, which projected \$131 billion in deficits over the same period. Once again, the “spend less” Liberal Prime Minister is proposing to spend twice as much as his predecessor, despite having campaigned on so-called fiscal discipline.

From my perspective, this is part of a troubling pattern. Guess what happened every time since 2015 that the old Liberal government set spending targets in a budget. It missed the mark every time. For example, in 2015, Prime Minister Trudeau promised modest deficits to fund infrastructure and invest in Canadians, followed by a cast-in-stone balanced budget by 2019. We all know the result: It was never honoured. The old Trudeau government created a fiscal mess with runaway spending.

It is easy to understand why the current Prime Minister criticized that record during the campaign and promised to fix it. Canadians expected a change in course, yet the budget from our new Liberal government follows exactly the same old path as the old one, only on a much larger scale. That is not what the Prime Minister nor any Liberal member of Parliament promised Canadians just a few months ago.

In my riding, I have met constituents who have told me they voted for the current Prime Minister because they believed in him. They believed in his promises. After all, bankers are supposed to be trustworthy; they are not supposed to make promises they have no intention of keeping. That, to me, is the real rub. The new Prime Minister is not even trying to spend less. In that regard, he is exactly like the former prime minister. It is not unlike in the movie with Alec Baldwin, *Glengarry Glen Ross*, but instead of ABC, always be closing, it is ABS, always be spending.

● (1330)

For all these reasons, I will, of course, be voting against the budget. Frankly, every member on the government side of the House should do the same, because they were elected on the promise to spend less, not unlike the elbows-up promise. However, that is a topic for another day.

In closing, I would like to thank all members for taking the time to hear my comments. It is greatly appreciated.

I expected the budget to be different. When the Prime Minister talked about the need to spend less, he made an excellent case for why he campaigned so heavily on the commitment. Many Canadians believed he would be the one Liberal Prime Minister who actually did what he said he would do, yet here we are. Again, the fiscal anchors are completely adrift.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister loves to say we should focus on the things we can control, but he does not follow his own words. He could control how much he spends. He could repeal the regulatory regime the previous Liberals created instead of drafting Bill C-5 to selectively manoeuvre around that regulatory mess. He has not done that. He could repeal the net zero mandate for electric vehicles, which automakers have said will harm their vehicle sales and their interests in Canada, but he has not done that either. He could repeal the industrial carbon tax, which makes Canadian steel more expensive and less competitive against steel from other countries that we compete against. However, he has refused to do that. He could decide not to finance BC Ferries' vessels built in China and let China finance its own shipbuilding industry, instead of Canada.

All of those actions would cost very little, yet the Prime Minister refuses to take them, despite preaching that he would rather focus on things he can control. Instead, he is choosing to spend money, and not just a little. It has been spend, spend and spend.

For these reasons, I believe the budget and the budget implementation act must be opposed, just as the Prime Minister argued during the election. We need to spend less.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members may recognize that, throughout the debate, there has been a whole lot of hypocrisy coming from the Conservative Party. Members should think about it. The Conservatives and the leader of the Conservative Party inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus during Stephen Harper's government. They turned it into a multi-billion dollar debt.

If we were to take a look at the highest all-time deficit in Canadian history, it was actually when the leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Conservative caucus, back in 2009. If we then take a look at Canada's deficit, we are actually number two in the G7, in terms of having the lowest deficit-to-GDP situation. Conservatives have absolutely no moral compass at all.

I would ask the member, what has changed? Why is a deficit bad today, when it was good while they were in government?

• (1335)

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I know that member gets really hot under the collar when people remind him that he has supported every Liberal budget since 2015. When Bill Morneau was the finance minister, I criticized him for allowing our debt to rise over \$1 trillion. This member said nothing then. We went past \$2 trillion, and we are now working our way to \$2.5 trillion under the current government, but he is still saying nothing.

I would get hot under the collar too if I was upset with myself, listening to criticisms that made me think twice, but that would mean the member would have to think at all. I have to think about that, whether he actually does.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague compared the current Prime Minister to former prime minister Trudeau, saying that they were exactly the same. Allow me to disagree.

These days, Quebec television programs are comparing the current Prime Minister to Stephen Harper. We can look to the budget to see if that is true. That comparison is not far-fetched at all, considering that the budget contains a measure that will gift \$100 billion in tax credits to the oil and gas industry.

That is irresponsible on two fronts, whether in fiscal terms and or in terms of assisting an industry that rakes in record profits year after year while worsening climate change by producing ever-growing amounts of greenhouse gas emissions.

Does my colleague agree with me that the current Prime Minister is less like Mr. Trudeau, and more like Stephen Harper?

[*English*]

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, with both the Liberal Party and the Bloc saying Stephen Harper this and Stephen Harper that, I think they have lost the plot. We just had an election in which the Prime Minister looked Canadians in the eye hundreds of times, even voters in this gentleman's province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

The Prime Minister promised the people of the beautiful province of Quebec and across the country that he would spend less. That is not a promise I take lightly.

[*English*]

I do not take it lightly when someone makes a commitment, reverses himself and then says we are the problem because we do not understand. The Prime Minister made a promise to all of us that he would spend less, but he brought us a budget that does the opposite. That is the problem.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians know that if they have a bad credit rating, it will cost them more to borrow money. Lately, Fitch talked about the Liberal government and raised the alarm that it is going to drop its credit rating to AA+ instead of where we are now, which will cost us more than the already billions of dollars that we are transferring to pay the interest on the debt.

Is the member concerned about that as well?

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. I believe that this year, we are at about \$52 billion a year just to cover the debt management program. I remember raising the same questions and concerns with Bill Morneau when he was the minister of finance, when we had just over \$1 trillion in debt. Now we are over \$2 trillion in just a short period of time, less than 10 years later. We are right to be concerned. In my home province of British Columbia, the B.C. NDP promised more spending than revenues in its budgets, and it was downgraded.

Government Orders

The member is correct that all of us in British Columbia are paying more in debt for the privilege of just servicing the debt. This is not going down on principle. On principle, as a country, we should be saying that we need to pay attention to the lines of where this is going. This is—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I would love to say it is a pleasure for me to take the floor today to speak to Bill C-15, but it is the opposite of a pleasure. It is reliving a nightmare.

I am going to start by pointing out a few things that have been missed in the discussion of the budget and the budget implementation act.

First, I want to share with colleagues something I do not think anyone has mentioned, and I wish we could do something about it, which is the decision of the Prime Minister that budgets shall henceforth only happen in the fall. To all my colleagues, who just went through a nail-biter of a budget vote in which the plea was that we needed to pass the budget or we would have a Christmas election, if we always have a fall budget, we will always face that threat: If we actually consider the budget properly, study it properly and perhaps even defeat it, we will face a Christmas election. This needs to be revisited. We cannot just accept that budgets are always henceforth in the fall with this new threat.

Second, on principle, I object again and again to an omnibus budget bill changing things that were scarcely mentioned in the budget itself. This is a position of principle that I have taken for many years. I would like to refer the House, to save time, to interventions I made in the 41st Parliament, in Hansard volume 146, to a point of order that was detailed on June 4, 2012, in which I pointed out the many ways in which omnibus budget bills are offensive to democracy and the ways in which, on principle, Parliament should be able to properly study all elements of legislation and not have them bound together. Particularly when saying it is all about the budget, one must at least make sure the budget itself mentions that this change is coming. There are a number of places in which that is not the case.

In light of my reference to historical background on this point, omnibus budget bills came into fashion in the Harper years. Justin Trudeau promised he would not bring in omnibus budget implementation acts, but then he did. However, they were never as long as this. For Canadians who do not know, the budget implementation bill runs to more than 600 pages. It took me a while to read all of it, and I have, which means it has taken me a while to discover sections I find particularly offensive.

Again, this is not the budget itself. This is Bill C-15, which was only recently brought in for consideration in this place.

With all due respect to our current Speaker, I think the greatest Speaker Parliament has ever had was Lucien Lamoureux. In 1971, he said that budget implementation bills or, for that matter, omnibus bills of all kinds are a slippery slope for democracy. He was referring to omnibus bills of all kinds. Speaker Lamoureux pointed out, “we might reach the point where we would have only one bill”

tabled at the beginning of the opening of a new Parliament, in which the government said that the bill would better the lives of Canadians, and it would contain all the legislation for the session to be passed all at once. He then said, “That would be an omnibus bill with a capital ‘O’ and a capital ‘B’”, but he went on to say that we are not there yet.

I worry that we are getting there. I was informed recently by someone in government that while Bill C-15 is an omnibus budget bill to implement budget 2025, it is in fact only part one of an omnibus budget bill to implement the 2025 budget, which is to say that we could be awaiting another 600-page piece of legislation coming sometime soon.

One has to ask a question about a number of measures in the budget that we find in the budget implementation act, and I wish we had time to study the bill properly, but we will not. This question is, why have the Liberals used the mechanism of special operating agencies to bring in numerous new bureaucracies, such as the Major Projects Office and Build Canada Homes? There are a number of them, and they will never have the transparency that they would if they had been brought in properly as agencies that were properly studied individually.

I am also particularly concerned that we should have built “Canada first” into this budget. I completely agree that it is a good idea to get rid of a luxury sales tax on certain products, but it should have the caveat that they are built in Canada.

● (1340)

There is nothing wrong with a luxury sales tax on airplanes, cars or boats that Canadians buy overseas, but domestic manufacturers were being damaged by this tax, particularly in my own riding. Recreational vessels would hardly be considered a luxury item for someone who lives on the coast. In any case, that would be removed and I am glad it would be removed. However, why not focus on Canada first and have that tax apply only to luxury products that are made outside of Canada?

Last, a number of things are quite disturbing to me. As members know, I voted for the budget, but there are things in the budget implementation act that were never mentioned in the budget itself. I know I cannot use props, but when speaking of the item itself in debate, there is an allowance for saying “in this book”.

I read the budget, and we were not given the full budget in the written document. We had to later get a memory stick, and it contained annex 5, which contains the legislative changes that were going to be made. Annex 5 is not in the text of the budget in the written, bound book, as we understand it, but it said there would be amendments to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. It is the first time the government has proposed to eliminate the five-year termination date for equivalency and administrative agreements.

Government Orders

There is concern about that in the environmental community. Why are we touching the Canadian Environmental Protection Act at all and the agreements that go to the question of protecting Canadians from toxic substances? Because this is an omnibus budget bill and because it is moving quickly, we are very unlikely to have a chance to study or properly debate this or even see these sections referred to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

If it can get worse, it gets worse. When I went through the budget implementation act, it was not until I got to page 536 that I found out the Liberals would not just change the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, as mentioned in annex 5 but not in the printed budget itself. By the time we get to pages 536 and 537 in division 32, clauses 548 to 549, we find that they would also change the International River Improvements Act, the Canada Wildlife Act, the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Antarctic Environmental Protection Act. Of course, we knew they would change the greenhouse gas pricing bills and remove other provisions that had to do with climate, but that was foretold. In division 42, again, there are changes to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act that were not included in announcements or in the budget document itself.

I find myself looking at the budget implementation act as separate legislation from the budget itself, as it is. I want to vote for some of what is in the budget implementation act. I like that we see the school lunch program. I like that we see a continuation of good programs, particularly for the social safety net. However, I wonder why we would not be able to properly study the creation of entirely new agencies. It was not until I got to page 448 of the budget implementation act that I found we would be creating yet another entity, or bureaucracy as the Conservatives would call it. There would be a Canada development investment corporation, to be created but not to be studied.

Omnibus budget bills are an abomination, and bills of 400 pages are an offence to democracy and to Parliament. They can never be properly studied. They can only be pushed through with the rallying cry “If we do not pass it, we are stuck with a Christmas election”. God bless everyone.

• (1345)

The Deputy Speaker: Before I go to questions and comments, I note that the member very artfully skidded the line with the use of props in her hand.

Questions and comments, the chief government whip.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member certainly is extremely judicious in her approach, and that is the theme of my question.

I respect the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for not only her passion for the environment, but also her passion for setting the record straight. Recently, she heard the House leader of the opposition, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, talk about the oil tanker ban, and she went to her social media platforms to set the record straight on the Hecate Strait.

She did that quite elegantly, and I really enjoyed the opportunity to learn about the west coast and exactly what is happening there as

it relates to the tanker bans but, more importantly, about the misinformation being spread by Conservatives. I am wondering if the member would like to take the opportunity to do that again now.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Regina—Qu'Appelle went wrong in his commentary. I hate the misuse of the English language by saying “the exact same”; it is redundant, but the the tanker ban, which I fear may be overturned as of today by the MOU, applies to areas of the northwest coast of British Columbia, and the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle said it did not apply to U.S. tankers that were using “the exact same” route. That is not the case. U.S. tankers use a completely different route from that covered by the offshore tanker ban. When leaving from Alaska with oil or heading from refineries in Washington state, they are completely to the west of the British Columbia coastline. They are far west of Haida Gwaii, west of our coastline—

• (1350)

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

[*Translation*]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my colleague from British Columbia and leader of the Green Party.

Many Canadians were surprised last week when the member asked the Prime Minister if he would respect the Paris Agreement, to which he said that he would indeed respect it. The Green Party member ultimately decided to support the Liberal government's budget. The Prime Minister gave exactly the same answer he gave two weeks earlier.

With everything that happened in Alberta today, is the Green Party leader still proud of supporting the Liberal government?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, of course the Prime Minister told me what I wanted to hear. What I wanted to know from the Prime Minister is that the commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to limit global warming to about 2°C, which we committed to through the Paris Agreement, will be honoured and that this is possible.

Today, in light of the agreement with Ms. Smith from Alberta, I think it is almost impossible to reconcile these two things.

The Prime Minister may be able—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Drummond.

Government Orders

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am going to pick up where my Conservative colleague left off. My question to the leader of the Green Party is one I ask with both consternation and curiosity, as there was a great deal of speculation around her support for the budget prior to the vote. It was not completely clear, but it seems that she found reassurance in commitments made by the Prime Minister.

Today, I find it hard to imagine that the leader of the Green Party is not feeling betrayed by the Prime Minister's commitment, firstly regarding the Paris Agreement, and then the encroachment he is authorizing on practically every jurisdiction to get a pipeline carrying oil from Alberta out to the Pacific Ocean. I would really like to hear what she thinks about that.

What does she think of what the Prime Minister said? On a scale of one to 10, how does she rate what the Prime Minister said today, with everything we are finding out?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, this is tough. It is true that it is practically impossible to honour both the commitment to the Paris Agreement and the agreement with Alberta at the same time. I will always do my best.

[*English*]

I will hold the Prime Minister accountable. He made a promise on the floor of the House of Commons. He does not get to duck it a week later.

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, federal budgets are not just about numbers on a page. They at least should not be about just numbers on a page. They must be about addressing the cost of groceries for struggling families and about the price of gas for workers who depend on their vehicles to earn a living. They should be about whether or not young Canadians can afford a home. As I said, at least they should be about that. The Liberals, though, unfortunately fall far short of that mark.

During the election campaign, the Liberals pledged to get their spending and their deficits under control, but what does this budget offer instead? There will be a \$78-billion deficit this year alone and projections of \$321 billion in new debt over five years, more than double what was promised. What was promised was too much already. It is a worse record than that of Justin Trudeau, who was the worst prime minister in Canadian history up until now. This is not just a broken promise; it is a cynical, self-serving betrayal of trust.

Every dollar borrowed today is a dollar that our children and grandchildren will have to pay back with interest. Let us not forget that interest payments are already exceeding what is spent on health care transfers in this country. This is not compassion; it is fiscal recklessness. It is all over the place in this budget.

The budget locks Canadians into a cycle of debt that will last for decades and decades. Thanks to the government, Canadians are already paying over \$50 billion annually in interest, money that could fund things Canadians need or, better yet, be left in the pockets of taxpayers, who earned that money in the first place.

Let us look at the opportunity cost that is being squandered by continuing to rack up the national credit card. Imagine what \$50 billion in annual interest payments could do. It could build dozens

of hospitals. It could build maybe 1,000 schools. Some 4,100 kilometres of new roads could be built. It could cover nearly half of Canada's 5% NATO commitment for our defence spending to ensure that we finally properly equip the men and women of Canada's Armed Forces. Best of all, it could give the average Canadian family nearly \$5,000 a year in tax relief.

Instead, that money just vanishes into thin air, into debt servicing. The Liberals continue to choose to increase that debt and therefore the cost of that debt. As a result, they line the pockets of bondholders and bankers, their Liberal friends. They call that investing in the future, but every extra \$1 billion that is borrowed today is actually a burden on Canadians who are not yet born, locking them into decades of repayments for sunk costs instead of leaving them with the means and resources to invest in their own futures and their own priorities.

I call the Liberals' debt and deficits approach what it really is: passing the bill for Liberal priorities today to Canada's children of tomorrow. Adding more government, more bureaucracy and more layers of red tape seems to be the Liberals' answer to every challenge. Their solution is to create new agencies, new programs and new bureaucracies that slow down progress and stifle innovation.

Let us think about some of the things they have done recently. We have an issue in this country with being able to get major projects built. Rather than removing a lot of the barriers and obstacles that already exist, which the Liberals, frankly, created, they have said to just build a whole new bureaucracy to decide if we might be able to exempt some of those things from the bureaucracy we already have. Well, how about just removing some of the obstacles and actually seeing things get built? That would make a lot more sense.

It is the same thing when it comes to building homes. Everyone in the home construction industry and everyone who is trying to buy a home already recognizes that the biggest cost going into the construction of a new home nowadays is complying with government, whether it is on taxation, red tape or bureaucracy. Instead of dealing with knocking that down, the Liberals are just going to build a whole other bureaucracy to supposedly build homes. More bureaucracy on top of bureaucracy, which is more of the same problem on top of the problem that already exists, is not going to get homes built.

It is the same thing when we talk about equipping our Canadian Armed Forces. It is great to hear of new investments being put in, but what the Liberals are going to do is spend all that money on new bureaucracy and consultants. What I am afraid of is that at the end of the day, there will be nothing left to buy the equipment and resources that our men and women in uniform need.

Statements by Members

• (1355)

More and more bureaucracy is not the challenge. Canadians do not need more office towers full of bureaucrats. They need homes they can afford, jobs they can count on and a government that gets out of the way so that projects can get built. Instead, they are getting more of the same failed Liberal policies in a new package.

Why does this matter? It matters because every dollar borrowed today drives inflation tomorrow. It means higher taxes, smaller pay-cheques and fewer opportunities for Canadians.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*English*]

WHITE ROCK YOUTH AMBASSADORS

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the White Rock Youth Ambassadors, a youth program in my community that predates the city of White Rock, British Columbia, itself. Launched in 1952 as the Miss White Rock pageant, a beauty contest, this initiative has evolved into a youth mentorship program benefiting hundreds of young people within the community.

In the midst of the pandemic, the program threatened to shut down right when youth needed it most. Fortunately, new leaders Suzanne Smith and Dionne Archer-Smith revived the program, ensuring that this 73-year-old tradition continues. Today, Miss White Rock Wenshu Ding and her eight fellow young men and women ambassadors are inspiring their generation to lead through volunteerism and a love of community.

I have had the privilege of working alongside these outstanding young leaders in my riding. With a program like White Rock Youth Ambassadors in Canada, the future is optimistic and bright.

* * *

WILDFIRES IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this summer, wildfires swept across my district and our province. Families lost their homes, their businesses and the places that shaped their lives. Through it all, our firefighters, first responders and volunteers worked courageously day and night, and we thank them for their tireless efforts.

However, what defines us in Newfoundland and Labrador is how we show up for others. Communities rallied together and local businesses stepped up, including the Mess Tent Poutinerie, which helped feed firefighters, first responders and volunteers with donated food and supplies from across the region.

As recovery continues, my office is working closely with the province and the federal government to ensure that every family and business affected by these fires receives fair and timely compensation.

At the same time, we need to work together on both sides of this aisle to have better forest management and better disaster preven-

tion and relief technologies. Today, as a symbol of renewal and celebration, we hear that the Red Ochre Café is reopening. We rebuild together.

* * *

IAN ROSS

Ginette Lavack (St. Boniface—St. Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, Manitoba's theatre community suffered a profound and heartbreaking loss with the sudden passing of Ian Ross, the celebrated Métis Ojibway playwright, storyteller and educator, at the age of 57.

Rooted in Winnipeg, Ian reshaped Canadian theatre. His groundbreaking play, *fareWel*, a dark, courageous comedy set on a fictional first nations reserve, earned him the Governor General's Award for English Drama, making him the first indigenous playwright to ever receive that honour. His work travelled as far as the Edinburgh Festival Fringe and touched audiences across the country. Through his work, he challenged us to see this country more clearly, with humour, honesty and unflinching humanity. His voice became iconic through "Joe from Winnipeg", a character whose wit and warmth became a part of our cultural memory.

[*Translation*]

Today, we pay tribute to his extraordinary legacy and extend our sincere condolences to his family, his community and all those he inspired.

[*English*]

May his stories continue to guide and uplift us.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Maple Ridge is home to the largest Royal Canadian Legion in Canada, Branch 88, with over 2,000 members. As a 20-year member and a veteran myself, I am honoured to rise for those who have served. I also recognize Mission's Branch 57 and ANAVETS Branch 379, whose volunteers work to support veterans and honour those who have sacrificed for the country.

Too many veterans are now struggling under the crushing cost of living crises created by the Liberal government. Others are on the street homeless. Liberals have hundreds of millions of dollars for a deal with the European Space Agency that will benefit the Prime Minister's company, Brookfield, but they are slashing over \$4 billion in Veterans Affairs. There are reports of veterans being contacted about assisted suicide, presumably to cut costs and services.

Statements by Members

Our veterans deserve dignity, not despair. They deserve support, not having to balance government's wastefulness on their backs.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NORMAND LAPOINTE

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to Normand Lapointe, a federal Liberal member for Beauce from 1980 to 1984, who passed away in Saint-Georges on October 22.

A man of conviction with deep ties to his community, Mr. Lapointe left his mark on regional politics through his sense of duty, his connection with residents, and his sincere commitment to serving the common good. A true mentor to many local elected officials and stakeholders, he inspired many of us with his attentiveness, his humility and his dedication. Until the very end, he championed a vision of a just and unified Beauce that is proud of its roots. His kindness, his simplicity and his ability to listen reflected a genuine attachment to Beauce and the people who shape it day by day.

On behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada, we extend our sincerest condolences to his family, his friends, and to everyone who had the privilege of knowing him. His human and political legacy will live on in the collective memory of the people of Beauce.

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

FAITH COMMUNITIES IN KILDONAN—ST. PAUL

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate remarkable milestones in Manitoba's faith community: the 100th anniversary of St. Anthony of Padua Parish and St. Mary the Protectress Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral, as well as the 200th anniversary of St. Paul's Anglican Church. I am proud to represent all three.

For a century, St. Anthony of Padua Parish has strengthened neighbourhoods through compassionate service. St. Mary the Protectress has been a place of belonging for generations of Ukrainian Canadians, and St. Paul's Anglican carries a rich pioneer history sustained through war, hardship and renewal.

These contributions reflect what faith communities across Canada do every single day. However, many places of worship continue to face vandalism and arson. No faith tradition should fear for the safety of its sacred places, and that is why we support robust protections for places of worship, including measures in Conservative Bill C-255 to hold offenders accountable.

As we honour 100 and 200 years of faith and service in our community, let us recommit to safeguarding the places that give Canadians hope and spiritual refuge.

* * *

MEN'S HEALTH

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as November ends, let us look back at the tragic data on men's mental

and physical health in Canada. Too many men are dying young from preventable causes.

Men account for 75% of suicides and 72% of opioid deaths. They are at higher risk for cardiac disease, chronic lung disease and many cancers. However, stigma and pride in being macho prevent them from seeking help, and 65% of men say that they delay seeing a doctor for symptoms of mental and physical health.

Men's health is not a partisan issue. It is a health imperative. Delayed care costs lives and harms families. As the mother of three men, I say let us break the silence, remove the stigma, advocate for research funding and mental health supports, and ensure confidential access to care.

Let us speak up and speak out. We can move men's health out of the shadows and protect and support our fathers, husbands and sons.

* * *

CANADA-ITALY INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, a bricklayer arrived on Canadian shores from Italy seeking a better life, and 75 years later, the granddaughter of that bricklayer serves in Canada's Parliament.

As a daughter of Italian immigrants, I am proud to represent my community of King—Vaughan. On Tuesday, I had the honour of being elected chair of the Canada-Italy Interparliamentary Group. I look forward to working with all parliamentarians and with Ambassador Cattaneo to advance diplomatic relations between our two nations and explore new opportunities.

Canada and Italy share a deep connection through over 1.6 million Canadians of Italian descent. Italian Canadians have left their mark on communities from coast to coast to coast. Canada's Conservatives stand united and ready to work with everyone in the best interest of Canada.

Viva Italia. Viva Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BREAST IMPLANT REGISTRY

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in November 2023, the Standing Committee on Health tabled a unanimous report calling for a breast implant registry and the recognition of breast implant illness. Health Canada has been dragging its feet, and three years later, nothing has been done. This has been going on for 30 years. Shame on Health Canada for neglecting the health of generations of women in this way.

Breast implants are associated with cancers, anaplastic large cell lymphoma, crippling fatigue, pain, severe weakness, stiffness, memory and concentration problems, rheumatoid arthritis, and the list goes on. Is this what we want for women?

Statements by Members

The Minister of Health must show political leadership so that women like Julie Elliott, Terri McGregor, Nancy Pratt, Isabelle Gaston and all other victims do not have to suffer any longer and so that their suffering is not in vain. Above all, we must prevent other women from experiencing similar suffering.

When will the minister take action?

* * *

• (1410)

QUEBEC'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's National Assembly adopted Bill 2 last month.

[English]

On November 9, 20 clinics in my riding and nearby warned that they may need to close their doors as a direct result of Bill 2.

[Translation]

Government funding and the salaries of the doctors who finance these public clinics will decrease significantly. Meanwhile, these clinics will be forced to see more patients more quickly, with fewer resources and longer hours.

[English]

These clinics care for over 415,000 people in the west end of Montreal. They offered more than one million appointments last year. They employ almost 400 doctors. Six to eight weeks from now, many of these clinics may close, not because of choice but because of Bill 2. If the law forces them to close, their patients will have no choice but to go to already overcrowded emergency rooms.

[Translation]

This would be disastrous for patients in my riding and across Quebec. I call on the Quebec government to amend Bill 2.

* * *

[English]

OPIOIDS

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, British Columbians are now seeing the consequences of the Liberal government's reckless hard-drug decriminalization. Even Premier David Eby has admitted, "I was wrong" and "It was not the right policy."

Communities in Richmond, Vancouver and across the province are experiencing open drug use and rising disorder, and families are increasingly afraid to walk in their own neighbourhoods. This crisis did not happen by accident; it happened because the federal Liberal government granted B.C. an exemption that allowed possession of fentanyl, crack cocaine and meth on our streets.

Frontline officers, health experts and local leaders have been pleading for help, yet the government still refuses to take responsibility. Will the Liberals end the hard-drug experiment now?

COLLEEN JONES

Hon. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of Colleen Jones, a Canadian curling great and a fixture in Canadian broadcasting for decades. A six-time national champion and two-time world champion, Colleen was a trailblazer whose excellence inspired generations, especially young women who saw in her what was possible. Beyond the rink, she brought warmth, humour and unmistakable energy to television, connecting with viewers as naturally as she competed on the ice.

On a personal note, I fondly recall the lighthearted banter Colleen once shared with my father, Don Duguid, during major curling broadcasts, moments that captured the camaraderie and joy at the heart of our sport.

Canada has lost a champion, a storyteller and a role model. I ask all members to join me in offering condolences to her family, her teammates and the many Canadians she inspired.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Kitchener, families are making heartbreaking sacrifices just to get by. Alex, a father, told me he eats barely half a meal a day so his children can have three meals a day. Kirby, who has to worry about not only his children but also his grandfather, shared with me that when he feeds them, he waits until they are finished, and if there is none left he will just have to wait until tomorrow. This is not okay, yet the budget offers nothing to ease their burden. Instead it piles on unprecedented debt that will drive inflation higher and push grocery prices further out of reach for Canadians.

Canadians do not need empty promises; they need affordability, dignity and hope. We cannot accept a budget that ignores the reality that Canadians and our children are going hungry. They deserve better.

* * *

[Translation]

ROLANDE FAUCHER

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I pay tribute to Rolande Faucher, a strong, dependable and passionate woman who was not afraid to speak her mind.

A tireless activist, sociologist and researcher, she devoted her life to defending francophone interests and promoting education and culture in Ontario. Rolande was more than just a community builder and leader. She was an inspiring female role model who had a huge influence on me and everyone else who had the good fortune to know her and work alongside her. Her courage and bold vision paved the way for cultural and educational initiatives, including a Franco-Ontarian cultural centre known as the Mouvement d'implication francophone d'Orléans, the implementation of francophone school governance, the francophone theatre centre La Nouvelle Scène, and the grassroots campaign to save Montfort Hospital.

She was a friend, a confidante, an ally and an exceptional Franco-Ontarian. She leaves behind a lasting legacy that ensures our francophone community will continue to shine.

May Rolande watch over us all, especially her children Luc, Anne-Chantal, and Alain, as well as her entire family and all her loved ones.

* * *

• (1415)

[English]

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 2.2 million Canadians line up at food banks every single month, and the unemployment rate is 6.9%, yet as chair of Brookfield, the Prime Minister helped the company avoid \$6.5 billion in Canadian taxes through offshore tax havens. While the Prime Minister dropped the most expensive budget in Canadian history outside COVID, the Liberal government has shown us its top priority: making Brookfield richer.

Canadians need transparency about the total incentive structure acting on our Prime Minister. Canadians need to know that the doubling of Trudeau's deficit is serving our total national interests, not simply those in the Prime Minister's circle. Canadians need to know whether the Prime Minister is incentivized to serve all Canadians.

* * *

COLLEEN JONES

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of a true Nova Scotian legend.

Throughout her decades-long careers in curling and journalism, Colleen Jones broke down barrier after barrier, smashing through glass ceilings. A two-time world champion, six-time national champion, and 16-time provincial champion, having played more Scot-ties games than any curler in Canadian history, she was a staple in Canadian athletics. If that were not enough, Colleen had a 40-year career at CBC, where she made history as the first female sports anchor in Halifax.

In 2015, she said the following: "My feeling is: Do the things that make us happy now, because tomorrow isn't guaranteed. Appreciate life, don't sweat the small stuff, and enjoy the ride." I met Colleen only a couple of times, but I think she took her own advice, and I am very hopeful she enjoyed her ride.

Oral Questions

I would ask all members of the House to join me in remembering this incredible woman and in paying our respects to her family, friends and loved ones.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in what year will construction begin on a new pipeline to the Pacific?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the world is changing rapidly. The United States, the world's largest economy, is fundamentally reshaping all its trade relationships, causing major disruption and upheaval for Canadians. It is time to transform our economy from one that is reliant on a single trading partner to one that is stronger, more self-sufficient and resilient to global shocks.

To these ends, Canada and Alberta share the same ambitions: diversify our export markets, make Canada an energy superpower and build a stronger, cleaner, more independent and more competitive economy.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): All right, Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot tell us the year in which construction will begin. Can he tell us in what decade construction will begin on a new pipeline to the Pacific?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is a really important day because we are taking important steps forward on co-operative federalism. The Prime Minister has been clear that we have always known we cannot reach our climate objectives if we are not working with all the provinces and territories. Today Alberta has committed to working with us on clean electricity regulations. It has committed in the agreement to working toward a stronger industrial carbon price. It has committed to working with us on methane regulations.

Those are important steps forward for Canada to move toward its climate objective, and we will keep doing that work.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they do not know the year that construction will begin, and they do not know the decade that construction will begin. The environment minister could not even bring herself to utter the word "pipeline" in her answer to the question.

Today's deal allows a proposal for a pipeline to go to an office in seven months. It will then be studied for two years, after which the Prime Minister will give a pipeline veto to the NDP B.C. premier, who has already said he is against it.

Is this pipeline not going to be built in the year "never"?

Oral Questions

• (1420)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Actually, Mr. Speaker, this is a big, large, great, grand day for Canada. Our government has reached an important MOU with Danielle Smith, the premier of the province of Alberta, that creates an energy transition in all aspects of energy. It sets the stage for an industrial transformation. It will make Canada stronger, more independent, more resilient and more sustainable, and it will include the largest carbon capture project in the world. It will mean that all of Alberta's energy resources are among the lowest energy-intensive in the world.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they will not tell us when a pipeline will be under construction.

Let us just unpack the Prime Minister's illusion. He is telling the "keep it in the ground" caucus members of the Liberal Party that they just need to be quiet because there will not be a pipeline anyway. What he will do is delay it for several years until after a prospective election, during which he can dangle a possible pipeline in front of the people, but after which he can hand veto power that is not in the Constitution over to the NDP B.C. premier, who will block the thing from ever happening.

Is it not true that this is not a pipeline but a pipe dream?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the country and indeed the world are calling out for serious leadership, for co-operative leadership, for leadership that brings people and parties together. I do not think the Conservative leader has any concept of what is required to do the kind of development he is proposing. Of course we will consult and deal with the duly elected Premier of British Columbia. Of course we have a duty to consult with first nations.

Of course we will do this in a co-operative way. We will do it in the Canadian way, and we will do it in the right way.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what they will do is stand in the way.

We know that the only thing stopping a pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific is the Prime Minister. Let us unpack the legality of it. The Constitution, paragraph 92(10)(a), gives the federal government exclusive approval power for a pipeline. Bill C-5, a bill the Prime Minister pushed through the House of Commons, and we even supported him, gives him the power to approve it.

We need the Prime Minister to do only one thing for this pipeline to happen: get out of the way. Will he do it?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Canadians elected our government, they were clear. They wanted to see us build a strong Canada, and they wanted to see us build it well and build it together. They wanted to see that we could work together as a country, and that means that we do things such as this agreement with Alberta, which would help us to not only move forward on industrial carbon pricing, move forward on methane regulations and move forward on clean electricity, but also respect other jurisdictions, such as the province of British Columbia, with which we must seek agreement.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member accidentally told the truth. She did not say that it moves forward on a pipeline. She said it moves forward on an industrial carbon tax, which will increase the cost of everything it takes to build a home, so it is a tax on homes, and of everything it takes to grow food, so it is a tax on food. It is a tax that drives production out, paycheques down and the cost of living up. Meanwhile, the agreement does not move forward with a pipeline.

We as Conservatives believe in clearing the way to get pipelines built. In other words, we would build a pipeline without a carbon tax. They would build a carbon tax without a pipeline.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I suspect Canadians are straining to find the Leader of the Opposition credible on any of this. This memorandum of understanding would create a carbon capture and storage system that would lead the world. It would include, of course, the bringing together of partners with whom we have a duty to consult and other jurisdictions. It would create jobs in the electrical system. It would create construction jobs. It would create opportunity across western Canada, but most importantly, it would make Canada an energy superpower. Why can the Leader of the Opposition not see that?

* * *

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, November 27, 2025, will go down in history as the date the Government of Canada completely abandoned climate issues and the people suffering because of them, both here and abroad, so it could benefit oil company shareholders, most of them American. The Government of Canada has signed an agreement that requires it, if necessary, to steamroll over British Columbia and over various indigenous nations.

After British Columbia, will it be Quebec's turn?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Bloc Québécois is looking for any excuse to sow division and stir up trouble in Canada. This should come as no surprise. What we saw today are the same things we are doing with Quebec, namely, working together to take ambitious action, ensuring that federalism generates economic opportunities, and yes, building an economy based on renewable energy and creating a climate of opportunity for our young people.

Why is the leader of the Bloc Québécois opposed to that?

Oral Questions

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we will not even pretend to say that they did not read their own document.

The document is clear. It claims there is just one Canadian economy, which is not that of British Columbia or Quebec, but that of Ottawa and Calgary, with no regard for environmental assessments, indigenous peoples or provincial powers.

Based on that, it looks like the Prime Minister is taking it upon himself to impose a business plan that will only serve the oil companies and himself.

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was very clear here in the House when he said that British Columbia and indigenous peoples have to agree.

What is more, this agreement includes important commitments with the Province of Alberta on things like industrial pricing, methane regulations, and clean energy development. We will continue to work with all the provinces to fight climate change.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, did I just hear the Minister of Environment and Climate Change endorse an appalling agreement that scraps greenhouse gas emission caps for the oil industry and even for electricity production?

Yesterday, I asked whether the government would formally and solemnly assure Canadians that no pipeline would ever be imposed without the free consent of British Columbia and indigenous peoples. The leader, the same one who smirks and says the opposite of the truth, stood up, said yes, and sat back down. He should have just stayed seated.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I am standing up, as are all my colleagues on this side of the House, because we have work to do. We are going to build a country, work with the provinces, consult with first nations and develop a climate framework that will enable us to achieve net zero by 2050. We are going to work together with all Canadians from coast to coast to coast. That is what we are going to do. That is the mandate we received from voters.

The Bloc Québécois can say what it wants, but we are here to build a strong Canada.

* * *

ETHICS

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the rules pertaining to a public office holder, the Government of Canada's Conflict of Interest Act clearly states that "No public office holder shall...give preferential treatment to any person or organization based on the identity of the person or organization that represents the first-mentioned person or organization".

The federal Liberal member for Laval—Les Îles is currently under investigation by Quebec's chief electoral officer for having participated in financial funny business in Ottawa.

Can the Prime Minister confirm that no minister, member of cabinet or member of his caucus is involved in this so-called funny business?

• (1430)

The Speaker: Let us move on to the next question.

The member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the functions of the Government of Canada. My question is about conflicts of interest. We know that the federal Liberal member for Laval—Les Îles is currently under investigation by Quebec's chief electoral officer. That is a fact.

Now, the question is a simple one.

Can the Prime Minister confirm that no members of his cabinet or of the federal Liberal caucus are involved in this scandal?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not a question about government operations, but I can confirm that all members and all ministers sitting on this side of the House rigorously follow the code of ethics imposed on us, which is one of the strongest and strictest in the world.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people in Windsor are tired of hearing promises. They just want to know why the Prime Minister stopped fighting for them. He said he would go elbows up at the U.S., but when he failed, he shrugged and said, "Who cares?" Workers in Windsor care. Our auto sector and our suppliers care. Conservatives care. Meanwhile, the U.S. signed an \$80-billion nuclear deal with Brookfield, the Prime Minister's own company.

Why is it that every time the Prime Minister travels, business only gets better for Brookfield, while Canadians are left out in the cold?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find that member's suggestion that the Conservatives care interesting because the Conservatives voted against 18,000 construction jobs at the Darlington new nuclear project, 9,700 jobs at the north coast transmission line in B.C., over 10,000 jobs at the LNG tube facility and 5,000 jobs at the graphite mine in Quebec. These investments represent real progress for workers.

Oral Questions

Here is something that we should know: Conservatives vote against jobs and Canadians. Our new government stands up for workers and jobs.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week we found out that the government sent 500 million tax dollars to the European Space Agency. Guess who owns half the U.K. campus that money is going to. You guessed it right, Mr. Speaker: Brookfield. At the same time, Windsor workers are being shut out of plants, contracts are stalling and families are worried about their futures.

Why is the Prime Minister sending money overseas and helping a company he is tied to instead of fighting to protect jobs in Windsor, which has the highest unemployment rate in the country?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member voted against the largest infrastructure investment in Canadian history. There were jobs for the IBEW, jobs for the carpenters, jobs for LiUNA and jobs for the union members in his riding.

We will be building big and building with Canadian steel and Canadian lumber. When will the Conservatives get on board with Canadian workers?

[Translation]

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is yet another scandal.

In the federal budget, the Liberal government prioritizes funding for the construction of modular housing, as does Brookfield. The Prime Minister prioritizes funding for nuclear energy, as does Brookfield. The Prime Minister prioritizes funding for rail transportation, as does Brookfield. The Prime Minister prioritizes funding for data storage, as does Brookfield.

Why is the Prime Minister sacrificing our national interest for his own personal gain?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while I do recognize my colleague's flair for the dramatic every time he rises in the House, his remarks remain rather weak.

When the Leader of the Opposition was in charge of the housing file, he built six housing units across the country. On this side of the House, we are making unprecedented investments to build affordable housing, increase the housing supply and reduce pressure on first-time homebuyers, among other things. That is great news for Canadians.

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are some more examples. The Prime Minister is prioritizing funding for artificial intelligence, and so is Brookfield. The Prime Minister is prioritizing funding for clean energy, and so is Brookfield. Last week, we learned that the Liberals have earmarked 500 million taxpayer dollars for the European Space Agency. Guess who owns 50% of the campus? Yes, it is Brookfield.

Why is the Prime Minister sending our jobs abroad and our money into space, and why is he putting his own financial interests ahead of the interests of all Canadians?

• (1435)

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whose interests did my colleague have in mind when he voted against the budget, which provides for a tax cut for 22 million Canadians, the Canadian dental care plan, the Canada child benefit, jobs at the port of Quebec City, jobs at the port of Saguenay, economic development, and jobs in his region at the Davie shipyard? He certainly was not thinking about his constituents' interests.

[English]

Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's Brookfield conflicts of interest continue to grow with his keeping his shares, options and performance pay, which are worth millions of dollars. Every major decision the PM says he is making for Canada, such as nuclear deals, AI, EU space agencies and many more, has the potential to make him wealthier. While Canadians suffer, business for Brookfield has never been better.

When will the Prime Minister admit his conflicts, divest his shares and prioritize Canadians' best interests rather than his own portfolio investments?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, the announcement with the Prime Minister and the Premier of Alberta is good news for workers all across the country. It is good news for workers in Alberta. It is certainly good news for skilled tradespeople and the young apprentices who are and learning these trades. This is an announcement about prosperity and shared prosperity. It scopes in indigenous people and creates wealth. I certainly hope that the member understands that this is something that will deeply benefit not only his province but also the entire country.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning's announcement of yet another dirty oil pipeline has cracked the Prime Minister's green veneer. Beneath that veneer, he is bitumen-black, just like the Conservatives, and maybe even blacker, because Stephen Harper himself could not get a pipeline through. The Liberals announced a second one this morning. There may even be others. They have given up all hope of meeting the greenhouse gas reduction targets.

On environmental issues, are they worse than the Conservatives, or is this a pot-kettle situation?

Oral Questions

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said it before, and I will say it again. We can only achieve our climate goals if we work with the provinces and territories. Canadians elected us because they wanted to see us work with the provinces and territories.

This agreement represents Alberta's commitment to work with us on an industrial price, on methane regulations and on clean electricity. That is what we need to do to fight climate change, and we are doing it with the provinces and territories.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the environment minister is defending pipelines. Now we have seen it all. Let us take a look at our new so-called green Prime Minister's new record: He scrapped carbon pricing, abandoned targets for zero-emission vehicles, sabotaged oil and gas emissions caps, offered billions of dollars in tax credits for fossil fuels and boycotted COP30. He is exempting oil projects from environmental assessments with Bill C-5 and he is building another pipeline that will violate the west coast moratorium on tanker traffic in a marine protected area.

Is this the Liberal record, or Donald Trump's?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected us to build a strong Canada, and we are going to build it.

Let us look at the projects we have put forward, including a hydroelectric project in Iqaluit and a clean electricity project in northern British Columbia. We have projects, and we will continue to do the work.

Again today, we are showing that we are moving forward with industrial carbon pricing, methane regulations and clean electricity. We are not just putting forward regulations. We are showing how we are going to build Canada, and we are going to do it right.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after failing to reach an agreement with the United States, the Prime Minister said, "Who cares?". The Prime Minister backed down on the digital services tax without getting anything in return. I mean he got nothing in return for Canadians, because one day later, the Americans signed an \$80-billion nuclear deal. Who did they sign it with? They signed it with Brookfield, the Prime Minister's company.

Why is the Prime Minister sacrificing the interests of Canadians rather than his own interests?

I can predict what the member is going to say. He is going to talk about the budget, pipelines, housing, when pigs fly, and I will not get an answer.

● (1440)

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news for all the workers across Canada. All of the major projects we are introducing will generate good jobs for unionized workers in all trades across the country.

This will move Canada forward.

[English]

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, "Who cares?" answered the Prime Minister, when asked about contact with the U.S. President on a trade deal.

Everyday Canadians care, everyday Canadians who are going broke or who are losing their jobs because of this trade uncertainty. In my city of Toronto, investment, commerce and real estate have been frozen. Only 25 new condos were sold last month in a city of three million. Other than Brookfield, nobody can make a decision because of the uncertainty caused by the Prime Minister's failure to get a trade deal.

Instead of being dismissive and derisive, why does the Prime Minister not keep his word and finally get a trade deal?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I stood with the Prime Minister and the president of Dofasco as we announced additional supports for steel, for lumber, for communities, for organizations and for their employees, who have been deeply impacted by tariffs. They are not only encouraged by our support; they are excited about the future. Do members know why? It is because they have an opportunity through buy Canada policies to pivot their products and sell to Canadian projects.

That is what Canadians expect, that we invest in ourselves and take care of ourselves, something these guys cannot get.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister went from promising elbows up to throwing his hands up and saying, "Who cares?" the moment the President pushed back. He caved on the digital services tax, abandoned countertariffs, and walked away from the softwood legal fight, leaving Canadian workers totally defenceless. We thought he got nothing in return, but it turns out he got nothing for Canadians, because just days later the Americans signed an \$80-billion nuclear deal with his former company, none other than Brookfield. While Canadian workers are left standing in the penalty box, the Prime Minister's friends are skating away with the puck.

Why is the Liberal Prime Minister trading away Canada's national interests while advancing his own personal interests?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, that member voted against the budget, which is going to see the largest investment in infrastructure across this great country. We are going to be building homes, community centres, hospitals, bridges and roads, all with Canadian steel, Canadian lumber and Canadian unionized workers.

Oral Questions

Every day when the Conservatives come in here, they vote against jobs and they vote against Canadians.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that member did not answer the question, so I am going to ask it again. The Prime Minister caved on countertariffs, on digital services taxes and on legal disputes about softwood lumber. We thought he was getting nothing for Canadians, but it turns out he was getting lots for his company, Brookfield. Days after he was in the White House, the Americans signed an \$80-billion nuclear reactor deal with Brookfield.

Why is it that everywhere the Prime Minister goes, Brookfield gets a sweet deal and Canadians get no deal? Why?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking about trade, Canadians know that two-thirds of our economy is powered by trade. We are opening doors for Canadian products to reach new global markets. We signed new trade deals with Ecuador and Indonesia, and an investment agreement with the U.A.E., securing a \$70-billion commitment for more investments in Canada.

That is what this government is focused on: opening new doors and more opportunities for Canadian workers and businesses.

Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, can the Prime Minister explain to Canadians why every time we ask about a conflict of interest with Brookfield, his answer is basically, who cares, nothing to see here, and just ignore the fact that he used to run the place. Canadians are starting to wonder: If Brookfield were any closer to the government, would it need a visitor's pass or just a set of cabinet keys?

How can Canadians trust that decisions are not being made in a boardroom instead of the House of Commons, or is the Liberal government now offering loyalty points for conflict of interest?

• (1445)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians made a decision on April 28 between two visions for this country: a vision of hope and a vision of leadership versus slogans and division. Our Prime Minister is a world economic and business leader. He has travelled the world building up relationships and signing deals to build our economy, something that leader has never worked a day in.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Emma Harrison (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we know meaningful consultation with indigenous rights holders is essential to protecting rights, supporting sustainable development and building respectful long-term relationships.

Could the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations share how early and ongoing engagement with indigenous communities is helping improve our federal approach to consultation?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all major projects will only proceed after meaningful consultation with indigenous rights holders. We cannot and

will not move forward at the expense of indigenous rights. Budget 2025 invests \$10.1 million in the federal initiative on consultation. This includes funding for consultation protocols, which set out clear, mutually agreed processes for how communities want to be engaged, making consultations more efficient and respectful. We have also invested in indigenous-led resource centres, which provide the research, technical advice and expertise communities need.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals killed the northern gateway pipeline project, making Canada more dependent on the U.S. Now, the Prime Minister is putting on a big show, but he is setting up another process for a pipeline to fail, with new hurdles and hoops and, worst of all, a massive increase to the industrial carbon tax. The proposed pipeline is never going to happen, because the Prime Minister is giving a veto to the B.C. premier. What is guaranteed to happen after April 1 is that Albertans will pay a very real and very massive hike in the industrial carbon tax.

Why is the Prime Minister more intent on hiking carbon taxes instead of building pipelines?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is perplexing to us over here why they keep talking about some supposed veto by the B.C. premier when, in fact, of course, we will deal with the people and the province of British Columbia. What they do not mention is the signature of the Premier of Alberta on a memorandum of understanding that commits us to consulting provinces, consulting first nations, building out clean and renewable technologies, an electric grid, and building and creating opportunity for young western Canadians for generations to come.

Oral Questions

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it does not matter how many signatures they put on that MOU if they give a giant veto stamp to the British Columbian premier. Instead of just repealing all the Liberal leave-it-in-the-ground laws that killed energy projects, the Prime Minister has just unveiled a new process that is designed to fail. He is giving an unconstitutional veto to the B.C. premier. He is forcing Albertans to pay billions of dollars to put air into the ground, and now he is hiking the industrial carbon tax. Every time the Liberals hike those carbon taxes, everything gets more expensive.

Why is the government forcing through a massive hike to the carbon tax instead of just getting out of the way?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians watch this debate unfold, they will take note of lines like putting “air into the ground”. In fact, we are putting carbon into the ground. We are taking it out of the atmosphere, making our production of energy resources less carbon-intensive and putting carbon, in fact, underground, therefore, committing Canada to the fight against climate change. It is very interesting, and I know Canadians will be following this debate with great interest. The slogans of the Conservatives will be something they will not forget.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current Prime Minister was the adviser to the last prime minister. Under his watch, no private company was able to build a pipeline, not TC Energy, not Enbridge, not Kinder Morgan, just the Canadian taxpayer. Now, we learn Alberta must initiate a carbon capture project via the Pathways Alliance in exchange for a pipeline. Who has a significant stake in Entropy, one of the leading Pathways carbon capture companies? It is none other than the Prime Minister's company, Brookfield.

This begs the question, is the only way anything can be built in Canada is if Brookfield profits?

• (1450)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the owners of the Pathways project for carbon capture and storage are in fact six oil and gas companies, all of which operate in the province of Alberta and employ thousands of—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Ponoka—Didsbury has the floor.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know the Prime Minister has been meeting with Brookfield executives behind closed doors. This is the same Prime Minister who served as board chair of Brookfield Asset Management. Now we learn that he will not allow Alberta to build a pipeline unless it initiates a \$16.5-billion carbon capture project where Brookfield profits. The taxes and royalties from a pipeline should be used for doctors, nurses, roads, schools, police, housing and securing our country, but instead, billions will now pour into the coffers of corporate giants and Liberal insiders, including, of course, Brookfield.

How much revenue does the Prime Minister have to divert to his own company before he demands that Canada just simply change its name to Brookfield?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the members across, and maybe in particular those members from the province of Alberta, really underestimate how strongly their constituents feel about having a plan to reduce our carbon emissions, to reduce the intensity of our energy production, to, yes, lead the world in carbon capture and storage, and to build an energy grid throughout western Canada that makes sure renewable energy gets across western Canada. Most importantly, they underestimate the hopes of the parents of young Albertans who want to see a future for them in that province, and that is what this thing does today.

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's own cabinet and caucus are fighting over this pipeline announcement. Ministers are worried. B.C. Liberal caucus members are “seething” and “angry” and leaks are coming out by the hour. Meanwhile, Canadians know the real issue: Without a pipeline to the Pacific, the United States is basically our only market for Canadian oil. We cannot reach global buyers until we have coastal access.

When will the Prime Minister stop managing caucus drama and start using the authority he already has to guarantee a pipeline build to the coast?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day because this MOU means jobs in clean energy, jobs building data centres and jobs building the largest carbon capture project in Canada. These are jobs for young people, good union jobs for the building trades, for the IBEW, for the ironworkers, for LiUNA, for the UA and for the millwrights, for the workers who build this country every day.

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, approving a nation-building project like a pipeline to the coast is the Prime Minister's responsibility. It sits squarely in the federal government's hands. Instead of owning that responsibility, the Prime Minister is letting the NDP premier in B.C. have a veto, and he is doing it to calm the anger in his own caucus, not to move the country forward.

When will the Prime Minister stop hiding behind the NDP premier and make the call that only his government has the jurisdiction to make?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member is a British Columbian MP. Is she seriously suggesting the people and the Government of British Columbia should have no say about a piece of infrastructure that will go across the entire breadth of that province? It is very interesting to me that this member, who represents British Columbians, would want to subtract the voice of her own provincial government from that debate, and for that matter, subtract the voices of first nations. This is a historic agreement. It sets out a path forward, but we are going to do it the Canadian way: co-operatively.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister facing open rebellion? A Liberal MP told CBC News that their caucus is “seething” and “angry” over a pipeline. No wonder the Prime Minister keeps flip-flopping. One day he is for a pipeline. The next day he claims it is up to B.C. NDP David Eby. The Constitution is absolutely clear that the sole authority over pipelines is the Prime Minister.

Is the Prime Minister breaking his promise to “no pipeline” David Eby, or will he break his promise to build it through delays, over-regulation and endless consultations?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again a British Columbian member of Parliament is standing up wishing to subtract the voice of his own provincial government, the duly elected government of the people of British Columbia, who wish to have a say over a development of infrastructure that would span the entire breadth of that province. I think when the member thinks a little more seriously about this issue, he will agree that co-operative federalism and working with provinces, including Alberta and British Columbia, on things like this historic announcement today are the right way to go.

• (1455)

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are looking for collaboration, no doubt, but the Prime Minister went around to wave just another piece of paper that promises a potential pipeline maybe sometime in the future. In reality, it guarantees nothing. The only thing that was guaranteed today was that Albertans and Canadians will continue to pay more with the industrial carbon tax.

Canadians are looking for a guarantee. The simple question is, can the Prime Minister guarantee what year shovels will be in the ground on this proposed pipeline?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two British Columbian MPs want to subtract the voice of their provincial government, and now an Albertan MP questions the wisdom of the Conservative Premier of Alberta, whose signature is still wet on a memorandum of understanding that comprehensively sets out an economic path forward for her province and for the young people who wish to create an economic future for themselves in that province.

I am amazed that the Conservative MPs from British Columbia and Alberta want to deny their own provincial governments the ability to create an economic future in western Canada.

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is still no construction date for the pipeline.

The Prime Minister blames everyone else, like the B.C. government and first nations, anyone but himself. Of course, it is really the “leave it in the ground” members of his own caucus who are trying to stop it.

The Prime Minister could approve an oil pipeline to the Pacific without a carbon tax, without delays and without any excuses. The proof is in the pudding, and it is not a pipeline until it is built.

Will the Prime Minister tell Canadians today when shovels will be in the ground on this oil pipeline? He can just give us a year.

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to see the Conservatives have a new-found interest in Canada's Constitution. They point out that on occasion the federal government has certain authorities in this respect, but they have not taken care to actually read the entirety of the provision they so routinely cite, which similarly empowers provincial governments to build the infrastructure necessary to operate a pipeline in this country. They similarly ignore section 35 of the Constitution, which guarantees the inherent and treaty rights of indigenous peoples in this country and requires the government to consult with rights holders who may be impacted.

We can build this country if we work together. It is a shame the Conservatives, after many opportunities to govern, have failed to learn that lesson.

* * *

STEEL AND ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of Hamilton know that Canadian steel is an integral part of building a secure, sovereign Canada. Everything from homes to defence requires a strong—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I will let the hon. member start over but without gesticulation.

The hon. member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas.

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, the people of Hamilton know that Canadian steel is an integral part of building a secure, sovereign Canada. Everything from homes to defence requires a strong industrial steel sector.

With the announcement yesterday, it is clear that our government is focused on building Canada strong, with Canadian steel to build Canadian products, building the strongest economy in the G7.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. member, from the top, please.

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, the people of Hamilton know that Canadian steel is an integral part of building a secure, sovereign Canada. Everything from homes to defence requires a strong industrial steel sector.

With the announcement yesterday, it is clear that our government is focused on building Canada strong, with Canadian steel to build Canadian products, building the strongest economy in the G7.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Obviously some members want to hear this over and over again.

From the top, the hon. member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas.

• (1500)

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, the people of Hamilton know that Canadian steel is an integral part of building a secure, sovereign Canada. Everything from homes to defence requires a strong industrial steel sector.

With the announcement yesterday, it is clear that our government is focused on building Canada strong, with Canadian steel to build Canadian products, building the strongest economy in the G7.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families please tell this House how our government is supporting steelworkers as we transition to buy Canadian industrial self-reliance?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, finally, Hamilton gets a voice in the House of Commons with a strong MP who had to repeat his question four times. How disrespectful is that to the workers of Hamilton, who are really struggling and working so hard to pivot to new product and new markets. That is why standing beside ArcelorMittal Dofasco yesterday, one of the backbones of our steel industry here in Canada, and the Prime Minister as we continue to support that industry to pivot to new markets and to new product was so important.

On this side of the House, we will listen to the steel industry—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Cowichan court ruling in the British Columbia Supreme Court is causing real damage in Richmond. Banks are pulling back, buyers are walking away, investment is on hold and families and businesses are being left in limbo.

On October 23, the Richmond council urgently asked the Attorney General to protect private property rights. The Liberal government did not even bother to respond. A few days ago, the Rich-

mond council passed another motion demanding immediate federal action to mitigate the harm to affected residents.

Why is the government abandoning the people whose homes and livelihoods are now at risk?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court's ruling and appealed it on September 8. We are reviewing potential legal arguments, and all options are on the table. Further legal clarity is required to address the decision, particularly relating to private property rights.

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

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, families, farmers and businesses, the people who bought and own property in my community of Richmond, are now fearful their titles may no longer be secure because of the Cowichan ruling. Property ownership is one of the core institutions upon which this country is built. The Liberal government's failure to properly fight for and communicate with folks in B.C. has created an environment of fear and dread that they may soon lose their rights over their own property.

What will the minister do to ensure that countless B.C. residents will not lose their rights as property owners?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court's decision and appealed the decision alongside the Government of British Columbia, the City of Richmond, the Musqueam, the Tsawwassen and the Cowichan. We absolutely understand the concerns of residents, which is why we have taken this step. We are reviewing potential legal arguments. All arguments and all options are on the table.

As this case is before the courts, I will not comment any further.

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this appeal will drag out for years. The Cowichan Tribes v. Canada court decision continues to put private property rights at risk. Uncertainty is now escalating into anger and unrest. Landowners are unable to get mortgages, businesses are building facilities in the U.S. instead of B.C. and neighbours are turning on each other with verbal threats.

Will the Prime Minister finally show some leadership and confirm that this appeal will always protect private land title, and will he acknowledge that this is an existential threat to the institution of private property ownership across Canada?

Oral Questions

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned multiple times in question period today, as well as in past question periods, our government disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court decision and we are appealing it. We are reviewing all options.

As this case is before the courts, I will not comment any further.

* * *

• (1505)

PUBLIC SAFETY

James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across the country, Canadians are seeing a rise in hate, threats and intimidation aimed at our communities. If the Conservatives are finally ready to put the safety of their own communities first, the combatting hate act is right in front of them.

Can the Minister of Justice tell us what this legislation would mean for the safety of our neighbourhoods, schools and places of worship?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want this Parliament to take action to combat a rising trend of hate crimes in this country. For our part, we have introduced Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, which seeks to protect Canadians by putting in place criminal penalties for those who would commit hate crimes against people, whether on the doorsteps of our religious institutions or in our communities more broadly.

This is an important day in the future of this legislation. The justice committee will be looking at the specific clauses of this bill after question period today, and Canadians will come to understand which parties are interested in protecting communities against hate and which are more interested in obstructing and delaying this legislation. When Canadians are watching, I hope we can demonstrate a spirit of collaboration and—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a senior Liberal debating my bill to stop leniency for non-citizens convicted of serious crimes said this: “If someone is going out there and raping another individual, do we really believe that they are going to get special treatment from a judge...?” Well, the very next day, there was a report of a non-citizen in Barrie being convicted of raping a 13-year-old little girl and impregnating her twice, and the rapist had been given an adjournment to see what impact his guilty plea would have on his immigration status.

Will the Liberals admit that they were wrong?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in place that say if a non-citizen commits a crime and serves a sentence, they are removed from Canada. CBSA works on these cases, and it prioritizes criminal cases when making removals.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is trying to revive a failed bitumen pipeline from Alberta through B.C. that went nowhere under Stephen Harper's Conservatives and still has no first nation consent. Talks about ending the oil tanker ban to enable this scheme in an MOU without B.C. at the table and without coastal first nations involvement is harming a critical relationship in getting things done.

Does the Prime Minister actually realize that pushing a project the coast has already fully rejected is breaking trust with coastal first nations?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said this in this House, and I will repeat it because I think it is very important to hear it again: We need to ensure the agreement of British Columbia and of first nations. That is an important part of how we work forward on building a strong Canada. I hope that by repeating this, everyone can make sure those words are heard.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, at no time during the campaign did the Prime Minister say the tanker ban would be lifted or changed. B.C. coastal first nations are saying loud and clear that the tanker ban is not up for negotiation, and no MOU will change that.

The secret deal signed behind closed doors without B.C. and first nations at the table is a betrayal. Enbridge 2.0 will not proceed without first nations' free, prior and informed consent, and B.C. will not stand for it.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that this is a pipeline to nowhere but the courts and stop wasting everyone's time with this political posturing?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I believe this is the last question, we can see the span of views in this chamber. It is interesting to me that it is a Liberal government and the Liberal Party that finds the co-operative, consensual way forward.

Of course, in response to the member, we will work with and have a duty to consult first nations. Of course, we will work with and have a duty to work with the Province of British Columbia, as we do indeed with the Province of Alberta. This is a visionary agreement today, a memorandum of understanding that sets a course for the future of western Canada.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

• (1510)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is every CPAC viewer's favourite day of the week, Thursday, when we have the Thursday question.

I would like to ask the government House leader if he can inform the House what we will be dealing with for the rest of this week and into next week.

Instead of a flashy MOU that has a carbon tax hike with no guarantee of a pipeline, will the Liberals bring in legislation to repeal the anti-energy laws that have kept the oil and gas in the ground and made Canada so dependent on the United States, or will they continue their habit of sending subsidized energy to the U.S. to fund the U.S. economy instead of the Canadian economy?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not trouble members once more today with the exciting details of our memorandum of understanding with the Province of Alberta, but I will provide some transparency and clarity, as always, on the way forward for Parliament in the spirit of co-operation and transparency as we work with my honourable friend and, indeed, all members of the House.

This afternoon, we will continue the debate at second reading of Bill C-15, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget.

Tomorrow, we will call Bill C-10, an act respecting the commissioner for modern treaty implementation, at second reading.

On Monday, we will see the House return to the third-reading debate of Bill C-4, an act respecting certain affordability measures for Canadians, which contains tax cuts. Indeed, I am sure the Conservatives will want to hurry that bill off to the Senate.

On Tuesday, we will resume the second-reading debate of Bill C-13, an act to implement the protocol on the accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership.

[Translation]

On Wednesday and Thursday, we will begin debate at report stage and third reading of Bill C-12, an act respecting certain measures relating to the security of Canada's borders and the integrity of the Canadian immigration system and respecting other related security measures.

For the benefit of those committees studying the supplementary estimates, I believe Tuesday, December 9 will be the final allotted day of the supply cycle, but I will confirm this at this time next week.

I also want to mention that there will be a ministerial statement on Thursday, December 4 to commemorate the Polytechnique massacre.

[English]

BUDGET 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.

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this budget does not tackle the real obstacles to growth. Instead of unlocking resource projects, building pipelines or enabling housing construction, the Liberals are busy picking winners and losers, leaving national projects that could create thousands of jobs stalled under mountains of red tape and regulation. Conservatives have a different vision, and that would be to get rid of some of the policies that are crippling our industries in this country, slash red tape and let Canadians build and prosper.

I wanted to talk for just a second or two about our veterans in this country, those who have paid the ultimate price for our country, those who have served and those who have sacrificed. Although the Liberals are running a \$78-billion deficit and spending like it is going out of style, the one area they choose to cut deeply is the services and benefits that our veterans rely on. There are \$4 billion in cuts to the services our veterans rely on, which they have earned through their service for this country.

Now there is this question mark hanging over all those benefits, because there are no clear answers, timelines or transparency on what those cuts are going to be, but it is creating a lot of stress and a lot of anxiety for those who have already sacrificed so much for this country. That is not leadership. That is not realistically meeting challenges. That is just cynical, sneaky and utterly shameful.

I want to contrast what we have seen in this budget with what Conservatives believe in. We believe in a Canada where the government serves the ambitions of the people and not the other way around. We have proposed solutions that would help to lift Canada out of the deep hole that we find ourselves in now, after ten years of Liberal government. We do this because Canada is one nation, and our fortunes, all political persuasions aside, are intertwined.

Conservatives simply want the best for Canadians, and after bearing witness to this decade of misguided, inept and too often corrupt Liberal government, we can clearly see that the Liberals are going to continue to repeat the mistakes of the past, those same mistakes that have caused Canada's economic future to go completely off the rails. We therefore offer alternatives to what has not worked.

Government Orders

We would be pleased for the government to take us up on our proposals. While they crib and water down some of our versions solutions, they never commit to the full and needed action. Our Conservative plan is clear. If we were to form government, we would end inflationary deficits and restore fiscal discipline. We would cut wasteful spending and bureaucracy instead of growing it. We would unlock resource projects to create jobs and generate revenue. We would lower taxes so Canadians could afford to eat and heat and house themselves. We would protect veterans with the benefits they earned and not claw them back.

That is how we would right the fiscal ship in Canada. That is how we would secure a future of opportunity, not through yet more crushing debt on our children and their grandchildren, and we certainly would not do it by introducing new layers of bureaucracy that set up delays and hurdles to the very solutions that Canada needs.

This budget is not a plan for prosperity; it is a plan for perpetual debt. It is a betrayal of promises, a burden on our kids and our grandkids, and a blueprint for bureaucratic bloat. Canadians know that they deserve better. They deserve a government that trusts them, that empowers them and that believes in their ability to build a stronger Canada. That is what the country needs, and that is what Conservatives offer, because a federal budget should not just be about graphs and pie charts; it should be a document with a serious plan to empower Canadians who want to afford a home, families who need relief from rising costs and veterans who deserve peace of mind that the promises their country made to them in return for their service will be kept by the government.

Canadians deserve better than the Liberal go-to of yet more debt and more bureaucracy, with the can of real solutions being kicked once again further and further down the road. That is why Conservatives will oppose this budget.

• (1515)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only part that I really agree with the member opposite on is when he was talking about the issue of leadership coming out of the last national election. He is right, in the sense that Canadians have a high expectation, and that is the reason the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party received more votes in the last federal election than in the history of our party and, in fact, the history of Canada.

At the end of the day, it is a very clear mandate, and the Prime Minister is living up to that mandate. We are not going to settle for any deal with the United States. We are going to take the time to get the best deal possible for Canada. Not only that, but we are going to continue to look abroad and expand our export markets. Does the member disagree with those two principles?

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, the member just demonstrated, exactly, the problem with the Liberals. When we think back to about six months ago, during the election, they had a very different story to tell than what we are hearing from the member today.

That is the problem with the Liberals. They keep changing their story every single day. No one can rely on anything they say, and no one can count on them, ever, to do anything. All they do is make

excuses and continue to change their story. Canadians deserve much better than that. That is not leadership. That is not even honesty. Canadians deserve much better. They will get it from the Conservatives in the next election.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I had the opportunity to work together when he was his party's whip. I know that he is a diligent and hard-working MP, and I want to ask him about the whole issue of seniors.

We were stunned to see that the budget included only one small program for seniors, the New Horizons for Seniors program. How can my colleague understand and accept that seniors did not get an increase in their old age pension?

[*English*]

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, I think that what the question really illustrates is how badly the government has failed Canadians. I think that what the people who were looking for something in the budget saw was a government that wants to build up more and more bureaucracy.

I mentioned veterans in my speech. The member mentioned seniors. Families, young Canadians looking to afford a home, people who cannot afford to put food on the table and everyone who is struggling in the country, and there are far too many people who are struggling because of the 10 years of the Liberal government, looked at the budget as something that would bring them some hope.

There was nothing for anyone in the budget, except for more bureaucracy.

• (1520)

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Before I begin, I want to recognize the life of Ray Hebert. Ray was a 45-year-old corporal with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He recently died of brain cancer. I offer my condolences to him and to his children. He was the son of Karen and Martin, the husband of Kate, brother of Adrian and father of Alice, Heather and Ben. I had the opportunity to work with him. I thank him for his service. May perpetual light shine upon him.

People like Ray, people who serve and work hard, expect that the government will be there for them. How is the government failing in that regard? I see so many ways in which it is.

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, I could talk forever on this, but I know that I will not be able to. The bottom line is that those who have served our country deserve to have a government that is there for them. When they did that service, that is all they expected in return, help with the needs that they might have in the future. The government is failing them. It is that simple. There is a \$78-billion deficit, but the one place where the government has decided to make cuts is to veterans, those who serve the country, who sacrifice for the country. There are \$4 billion in cuts.

The worst part of it all is that Liberals have not been honest. They are not telling veterans or Canadians what those cuts are going to be. We know they are going to affect their benefits and services. They would have to if they are going to make the kind of cuts they are talking about. They do not know what, and it leaves veterans in a situation where they are afraid, concerned and scared for their futures because the government is failing them.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation bill. We have spent a lot of time this fall talking about the budget. We waited over a year and a half for it, and it was finally tabled.

If we look at the nature of Bill C-15, it is an omnibus bill nearly 650 pages long. Columnist Pierre-Yves McSween likened it to a work of great literature or a sweeping novel, because it is so thick. This bill contains 80 legislative measures, and it amends or creates close to 49 laws. It addresses almost none of the Bloc Québécois's priorities and is a jumble of technical, fiscal and structural measures. There is a lot to unpack in it.

One of the reasons the Bloc Québécois opposed it is that it includes billions of dollars in new fossil fuel subsidies. It extends the investment tax credit for carbon capture, utilization and storage until 2041. Small nuclear power plants, which are used by the oil and gas industry, are now included in the tax credits. The word “greenwashing” comes to mind. Expenditures relating to liquefied natural gas conversion are also categorized as eligible expenditures. I will try to get back to the environmental issue later in my speech.

Even more worryingly, Bill C-15 is simply a dangerous piece of legislation. Bill C-15 is like Bill C-5 on steroids. It allows the minister to exempt any company from the application of any federal law, except the Criminal Code, for a period of three years that is, in practice, renewable. This measure would allow for any company to be placed above the law. It is a principle that we find very worrying. This is a power hidden in clause 208 of the bill.

For all these reasons, we have many concerns. However, I will be speaking about the budget more from the perspective of housing and assistance for people who really need help, which is not addressed anywhere in the budget. I will also highlight some additional measures. Lastly, I will speak about media and culture. We will come back to this.

Let us start with Build Canada Homes, an empty shell of an agency with a budget of \$11.5 billion but no detailed program. There is no guarantee regarding Quebec's share, which is causing worry for a lot of housing stakeholders. How much will Quebec get? People are asking me that question, because in the riding of

Government Orders

Shefford, social and community housing is a major issue. Granby had one of the lowest vacancy rates for a long time, and the needs are still significant.

I commend the efforts of the municipality, which is tackling the problem head-on and is working very hard, but the federal government is also going to have to do its part. There is no distribution plan, no criteria and no allocation mechanisms for Build Canada Homes.

Here is another request from the Bloc Québécois that was not addressed. Aside from housing, we wanted first-time homebuyers to be able to access interest-free loans to help them with their down payments. Young people who want to buy their first home need that assistance. The Bloc Québécois asked for this ahead of the budget.

With regard to Build Canada Homes, seniors are also wondering how many social and community housing units will be allocated to meet the needs of seniors who are currently losing their homes. As the Bloc Québécois critic for seniors, I have been hearing from people about this.

According to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 620,000 homes will need to be built in Quebec by 2030. Federal assistance has accounted for only 14% of housing funding in Quebec since 2018. Rents increased by an average of more than 7% in Quebec in 2024, while in Montreal, they increased by more than 18% for new tenants.

The budget did not renew and make permanent the rapid housing initiative, which in Quebec takes the form of a transfer intended for social and community housing. The Bloc Québécois had asked for this initiative to be renewed and made permanent. It is the only thing that was working well. We asked for this, but it is not in the budget, and that is a bit of a shame.

In terms of infrastructure, our local municipalities are asking for more resources to respond to new challenges, given the needs around climate adaptation and water supply. Recently, a local mayor was telling me about his municipality's water needs. He said he had managed to get some funding from the Quebec government, but the federal government had not chipped in.

The Bloc Québécois asked the government to create a new unconditional infrastructure transfer program for Quebec and the other provinces using a block funding approach. This does not appear in the budget.

Government Orders

• (1525)

With regard to seniors, there is no increase in old age security for seniors aged 65 to 74. However, according to the Hunger Count reports and SOS Dépannage in Granby, whose food drive kick-off I attended, the number of retirees and seniors needing food assistance is steadily rising. Despite these needs, there is still no additional help for those aged 65 to 74, who continue to be completely left out and who still do not have access to the 10% increase for those 75 and over. This inequity is creating a gap and leading to two classes of seniors. It is extremely concerning. Food bank workers, such as the worker in Montreal who recently talked to Radio-Canada, also recommend increasing old age security starting at age 65 in order to relieve the pressure on food banks. We all know that poverty and illness do not wait for people to turn 75 before they strike.

In the area of health, we still do not have the unconditional Canada health transfer top-up of \$11.6 billion over five years that the Bloc Québécois had requested, and yet the need only continues to grow. The government is patting itself on the back for committing funding for hospitals in the last budget, but there is no guarantee that there will be sufficient health transfers to ensure good working conditions for the health care workers who would staff those hospitals. These unconditional health transfers are important, and they are something that Quebec and the other provinces are asking for.

Secondly, there are a few additional measures we can highlight that are not too bad, such as the elimination of the luxury tax on aircraft and ships. This will restart a stalled market. I was hearing from the people at BRP back home about this. The budget also introduces a personal support worker tax credit of up to \$1,100. It expands critical mineral development, so there could be some significant opportunities for Quebec. There is a 15% clean electricity investment tax credit and a legislative framework for stablecoins. These are measures that are also found in the budget. I could also mention the high-speed rail project. The Bloc Québécois supports this concept, but we do have some concerns, because Ottawa is invoking its declaratory power to impose exclusive federal jurisdiction on a project that would normally fall under Quebec's jurisdiction.

Municipalities back home are also worried and are wondering what the federal government's vision is in terms of supporting their public transit plans and developing public transportation across Quebec. They get the impression that the federal government has given up on this altogether, even though public transportation is critical for fighting climate change and reducing our GHG emissions.

Third, I would like to address the impact of this budget on the media crisis. The budget permanently scraps the digital services tax, and yet this 3% tax would have generated \$7.2 billion over five years. That is a major loss when it comes to funding media, arts and culture. No measures have been proposed to give electronic media the same tax credit as print media. Ultimately, the government is completely giving in to pressure from Trump's U.S. administration, which is imposing tariffs on countries that tax web giants. This is a step back for Ottawa, when several European countries have resisted. By abandoning this tax, Ottawa is losing a major lever in the trade negotiations.

There is no question about the vital importance of journalism, especially in a world where fake news is on the rise and generative AI is amplifying disinformation. However, the government is taking away essential tools for funding newsrooms. I am thinking of Cogeco Media and the TVA station in Sherbrooke, which are very worried following the losses they have suffered. It is extremely concerning. Since 2008, 469 local media outlets have closed in Canada, and more than 50% of them were in Quebec. Today, one Canadian in three lives in a community that is at risk of becoming a media desert. At the same time, Meta raked in \$192 billion in profits in 2024 while paying almost no tax in Canada. TVA has announced 547 layoffs since 2023, and 34 local radio and television stations may close by 2026. The web giants pay an effective tax rate of about 4% in Canada, compared to 26% for SMEs. According to the OECD, Canada was one of the top 10 countries for digital tax revenue losses in 2023. The 3% tax that was recently repealed would have brought in \$1.4 billion per year for Quebec, prorated for its demographic weight. Just imagine what we could have done with that money to support diversity in private, community and cultural media.

In closing, I will say a quick word about the environment. Since 2019, Ottawa has provided more than \$18 billion in direct and indirect subsidies to fossil fuels. According to Environment Canada, the Ottawa-funded carbon capture project captures only 1% of oil companies' current emissions. Billions of dollars in public funds are being invested in the Pathways Plus project, which is a carbon sequestration project for oil and gas companies.

As for liquefied natural gas, its climate impact is 20% to 30% higher than reported when methane leaks are taken into account. Then there is the government's failure to reimburse, with no strings attached, the \$814 million owed to Quebeckers who were excluded from the carbon tax rebate. There is even a new pipeline project that was announced today at the expense of first nations communities and British Columbia. What will happen in Quebec? Let us not forget that Canada even received the fossil of the day award at the most recent COP. This is extremely worrying.

One last thing—

• (1530)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I take a look at the budget, there is so much in there for the entire country, but if I focus on the province of Quebec, I think of things like the aerospace industry with the military expenditures, the port of Montreal and so many other programs, including the enhancement of our arts and culture. There are so many positive things within the budget, yet the Bloc has made the determination to vote with the Conservatives against the budget and now the budget document, the budget implementation.

Does the member genuinely believe that the Conservatives would be better for her province and the people she represents?

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche: Mr. Speaker, the government can make the figures in the budget say whatever they want them to say. That is basically all I had left to say in my speech. The government has changed the accounting method for certain expenditures and investments, and there are now expenditures that are categorized as capital investments. This is quite worrying and it is one of the reasons why we are strongly opposed to this budget. That said, there are obviously other reasons too.

There are some worthwhile projects for Quebec, but I am also hearing a lot about what is not in the budget. When it comes to infrastructure, it is not true that cities have the money they need. Seniors, for their part, did not receive a penny in this budget. Our local media, TVA, Cogeco Média and others, say that the only money in the budget is for Radio-Canada. That does not help ensure a broad range of voices and media sources, which truly guarantees democracy in the regions. Apart from the fact that it contains a few small projects, this budget did not meet Quebecers' expectations.

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned many things that should have been included in the budget. Unfortunately, we have found that this budget includes many things that benefit Brookfield, not Canadians or Quebecers.

One thing my colleague took the time to mention is the digital services tax, which has been abolished. This tax could have been used to help our traditional media outlets weather the difficult crisis they are currently facing. Unfortunately, the Liberals decided to scrap it.

When we look at Brookfield's assets, what do we see? We see that the company has interests in Meta, Alphabet and almost all the other big tech companies. Does my colleague agree with me that the government has presented a budget that favours Brookfield, but not Quebecers or Canadians?

• (1535)

Andréanne Larouche: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière for giving me the opportunity to explore this issue, the elephant in the room that nobody talks about enough: this Prime Minister's ethics. The more we dig into the budget today, the more we uncover. My colleague talked about Meta. I could talk about certain investments. One of the issues I talked about is nuclear energy, because we also know that the Prime Minister has investments in the nuclear industry.

Why is he so keen on a pipeline, and why is he working so hard to move this project forward with Alberta? It is because he has a stake in it. When we dig a little deeper, we discover that Brookfield has a stake in a lot of things. What we have here is a Prime Minister who set himself up like a corporate executive to promote his own interests, not the interests of Quebecers.

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my colleague's wonderful speech, which, as always, was informed by the needs of her community, her riding.

Government Orders

Since she is also the Bloc Québécois critic for the status of women, I would like to know her opinion on something major missing from the budget: measures for women who, upon returning from maternity leave, do not have access to employment insurance if their position is eliminated or they lose their job. This is gender-based injustice.

Could she comment on that?

Andréanne Larouche: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are certainly asking good questions. I thank my colleague from Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon for giving me the opportunity to address this issue.

We are right in the thick of the 12 days of action to end violence against women, and we know that economic issues have a huge impact on a woman's decision about whether to stay in a cycle of domestic violence. Employment insurance discrimination contributes to impoverishing women and keeping them stuck in a cycle of poverty that ultimately keeps them trapped in a cycle of violence.

I want to thank my colleague Louise Chabot. I can name her now that she is no longer a member of Parliament. She was a strong advocate on this issue. She said that she was ultimately calling for a reform of the Employment Insurance Act because it is not feminist enough. She went so far as to say that the act is anti-feminist because of its excessive discrimination against women. This leave thing—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre.

[*English*]

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am really happy to have an opportunity to rise today to discuss Bill C-15, the budget implementation act, particularly around deep concerns that have been raised on the complete void of a gender-based analysis in the budget, including for projects of national interest.

The budget, for example, does not contain one single mention of murdered and missing indigenous women and girls, in spite of a study that was done by the status of women committee that directly linked increased violence against indigenous women and girls and resource extraction projects.

The whole budget relies on the lands, territories and resources of indigenous peoples, yet the budget has no mention of resources that will be provided for communities to put in place safety plans. The budget has no mention of how the government plans to protect indigenous women and girls from the violence that is often perpetrated in man camps, where we are seeing heightened rates of sexual trafficking, with Manitoba being the hub. There is no mention of that.

Government Orders

Even though the government has recognized this ongoing violence against indigenous women and girls as genocide, there is zero mention of it in this year's budget. With the government's own admission, in this year's budget, 41 measures will primarily benefit men, while only seven will primarily benefit women. This is shocking, especially with the planned budget cuts to the public service sector. Fifty-six per cent of those impacted will be women.

While I was glad to see in budget 2025 an investment of \$660.5 million over five years, with \$132.1 million ongoing, it came after great pressure from women's, feminist and gender-diverse organizations across the country fighting against the planned 15% cut. We know that gender equality cannot be an afterthought. It is part of a healthy, democratic Canada. However, this funding remains project-based, and these resources are not permanent.

The Liberals, in turn, expected to be thanked for only cutting women and gender equality by a smaller percentage than other departments, even though, historically, wages have been massively underfunded. The budget cut still amounts to \$8 million each year. It comes at a time when countless experts and even the former Liberal attorney general have said that gender-based violence in Canada is an epidemic.

I will remind the government that the only reason we were able to protect some of that funding was the leadership of frontline organizations that fought to keep this funding in place. Even in spite of the fact that we managed to save the furniture, the Liberals have still cut these programs from their current level by roughly 50%, at a time when we need much more, not less, public support for upholding the rights of women and gender-diverse people. We cannot build a healthy economy if we exclude women, the LGBTQ+ community and gender-diverse people.

● (1540)

An area of deep concern is the lack of funding for sexual and reproductive health, as well as universal access to contraception. It is one of the clearest, most evidence-based investments that a government can make in people's health. It protects equality and economic security because it gives people control over their futures. It reduces health care costs and strengthens gender equality across the board.

It does not just improve sexual reproductive health and individual health, but it also drives population-level change. If people can plan when they want to have children and if they want to have children, they are more likely to stay in school, stay in the workforce and avoid cycles of poverty. Universal coverage of contraception is preventative, and it is good for the economy. It is like all good infrastructure: It saves us money in the long run.

We know this, but the only thing we are missing now is the political will to make the financial investments to make it real. We need to make sure that people can afford medication when they need it, to sustain their health and bodily autonomy. That is something that seems to be off the radar of not just the Liberals but the Conservatives too.

The word "pharmacare" was only mentioned once in the budget. Even though the Liberals signalled that it was signed into law, their commitment to universal pharmacare is failing to extend agree-

ments to all provinces and territories that want it. We have to stop the practice of people having to pay out of pocket for contraception medications, which are vital for sexual and reproductive health.

The Liberals also broke their campaign promise to make permanent the sexual and reproductive health fund. The budget cut in health care for refugees is something that is problematic. It will escalate the cost of vital reproductive health care for women and gender-diverse people who have already been made vulnerable by displacement because of war and violence. The \$400-million planned cut to health care at the end of the decade is deeply concerning. Such cuts will shrink the national leadership capacity, and we need that to coordinate prevention, equity and access across the provinces.

Let us not forget that our health care system is already tapped out. It is already tapped out. Burnout is real with health care providers, nurses, midwives and physicians. We need to make greater investments in training health care workers, to fill jobs and rebuild a robust health care system in Canada.

I have to say one of the most disappointing parts of the budget to me was the alarming signal that potentially threatens Canada's 10-year commitment to global health and rights, which includes \$700 million annually for sexual and reproductive health. This has made Canada a global leader, and weakening that pledge on the global stage will not only harm millions worldwide but also erode Canada's credibility.

It is not surprising to me that our Prime Minister said he would not describe our policy as feminist foreign policy. It is shameful. We need to do more to protect gender equality in this country. We need it to be the centrepiece of a healthy economy, not an afterthought.

● (1545)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I posed a question earlier to her colleague. The member was a part of the Conservative Party of Canada's attempt to precipitate an election by voting against the budget. However, if we take a look at the budget, contrary to a lot of the criticism that she levels, it provides all sorts of sustainable programs, such as schoolchildren getting food, the pharmacare program that she refers to, the dental care program, the enhancement of the summer youth program and many other programs.

Why would the member want to have an election as opposed to supporting these types of programs?

Government Orders

Leah Gazan: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, the word “pharmacare” is mentioned only once in the budget. There are no other commitments.

I want to be clear: This is an austerity budget. Do members know who is benefiting from the budget? It is the corporations, from all the incentives that are being given to them. They just have to look at the last pages of the budget. Getting rid of the luxury tax on yachts and planes is one example. Do they know who is paying for it? It is women and gender equality in this country, sexual and reproductive health in this country and the 100 child care spots that the government promised and would now turn its back on in this year's budget. I do not support padding the pockets of the ultrarich.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been pointing out for the last little while that it is the Brookfield government, and the Prime Minister has been using the government's plane to fly around the world. Interestingly, he has not secured many deals for Canada, but shortly after the Prime Minister leaves particular countries and places, Brookfield signs major deals with those particular places. I am just wondering whether the hon. member has any comments to that effect.

Leah Gazan: Mr. Speaker, we know that, in this country, we have elected a banker for a Prime Minister. His only focus seems to be on dollar figures and not the people in Winnipeg Centre who are struggling to find housing right now; not the people in Winnipeg Centre who are struggling with mental health and addictions; and not the people in Winnipeg Centre who are trying to flee to safety, needing safe places to go. Protecting women and gender-diverse people is not a focus of the current Liberal government. The focus of the Liberal government is lining the pockets of the Prime Minister's corporate buddies.

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the NDP says it opposes handouts for oil companies, the underfunding of health care, and inaction on the housing crisis and on employment insurance reform. In fact, they have been calling for this reform for many years. However, it was the NDP that was able to get this budget through, because two of its members, the member for Courtenay—Alberni and the member for Nunavut, abstained on the deciding vote.

My question is quite simple and easy. How can the NDP claim to stand up for workers when it supports a budget that clearly abandons them?

[*English*]

Leah Gazan: Mr. Speaker, I want to be really clear. The NDP could not stay quiet and support a budget that supports corporations and corporate greed. At the same time, we heard people from our ridings and people across Canada who were very clear: They did not want an election during the holiday season.

We listened to those voices, unlike other political parties, because this is not the NDP's budget; this is the people's budget. We went out to the people; we listened to the people, and we showed up at the vote to reflect their desire, to say, “This budget is awful, but we do not want an election during December.”

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are living through some of the most challenging times in recent memory. Families are struggling to make ends meet, young people are losing hope for stable careers, and businesses are facing an economy of uncertainty. A housing crisis is pricing out an entire generation, youth unemployment is climbing and productivity, the engine of our prosperity, is in decline.

The Prime Minister promised a generational budget to solve these problems, but the only thing generational about the current budget is the debt it will leave our children. Canadians were told this budget would mark a turning point, with less wasteful spending, more real investment and a plan to lower operating costs while boosting capital projects, yet even the Prime Minister's own fiscal watchdog warns that what is being called capital investment is little more than creative accounting, a sleight of hand designed to mask the truth.

Under the Prime Minister, federal debt has soared to \$1.35 trillion. He plans to add another \$321 billion over the next five years, which is more than twice what Trudeau would have added in the same period. Interest payments will cost over \$55 billion in one year, which is more than the Canada health transfer and is even more than the government collects in GST revenue. That is \$3,360 for every Canadian household, money that could have gone to the essential services Canadians rely on. Instead it is flowing to banks to pay interest on debt.

This reflects the same economic approach the Liberal government has relied on for years: heavy spending, large deficits and the belief that government can borrow its way through almost any challenge.

Just months ago, the Prime Minister stood before Canadians and made clear commitments that the budget has shattered. The deficit he vowed to cap at \$62 billion now sits at \$78 billion. Spending was supposed to shrink; instead it has surged by \$90 billion, adding \$5,400 per household. Investment is collapsing, consulting costs are soaring and the Parliamentary Budget Officer warns that without accounting gimmicks, the operating budget will run an \$18-billion deficit by 2028, breaking the Prime Minister's flagship promise of balance.

These are not just numbers; they are broken promises, and Canadians are left to shoulder the cost. After 10 years of Liberal policies, the results speak for themselves. The self-proclaimed new government is anything but new or improved. Nothing has changed except the name on the Prime Minister's door. After the government got rid of the fiscal anchor of reducing the debt-to-GDP ratio, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has now warned that the ratio will rise and that Canada is no longer on a declining debt-to-GDP path.

Government Orders

The same insiders pull the strings, the same failed policies drive decisions and the same reckless spending continues, with no consideration for the struggles of hard-working taxpayers. That is why fiscal responsibility matters, not just as policy but as a principle I have lived with my whole life. My father came to Canada at the age of 19 for opportunity, and he started work as an electrician. He taught us that hard work is how people get ahead. He also taught us we cannot spend more than we have and cannot expect someone else to pay our debts when we live beyond our means. That is a lesson the government seems to have forgotten.

It was the same with my grandparents. They came to Canada with nothing but hope: hope for freedom, stability and the dignity that comes from providing for one's family. My grandmother was so thankful to come to Canada, and after one of her grocery trips, she was so thrilled about her full fridge that she took a photo and proudly sent it to her friends back home. To her, that picture was not just about the food; it was about Canada's promise to provide security, opportunity and a better future.

Back then, a full fridge was possible on one income for a family of nine, with no fear of falling behind on other household costs, but today that promise is slipping away. Parents are skipping meals so their kids can eat. A full-time job is no longer a guarantee that there will be enough money at the end of the month to pay the bills. The full fridge that my grandmother once celebrated is now empty for far too many people, yet Canadians are being asked to sacrifice even more by the Prime Minister.

Canadian food banks are seeing the impact first-hand, with over two million visits every single month. That is the highest level ever recorded, and numbers have doubled in less than a decade. Families that once donated are now standing in line. Food banks were never meant to become a permanent part of life for working households, but now their use is becoming normalized for people with a full-time job. Those are not my words; they are the words of the "Hunger Count 2025" report from Food Banks Canada.

● (1555)

The budget does nothing to change that. It piles on more debt, more pressure and more spending, without any plan to make life more affordable, and behind all the numbers are families and seniors whose lives are being upended. I recently spoke with a woman in her mid-seventies who shared something I will never forget: She can barely afford groceries, and she lives in constant fear that her furnace might break or that she might face a medical emergency. After a lifetime of hard work, she feels she has no safety net. She told me quietly that some days she hopes she will not wake up, because living in fear and indignity feels worse than dying.

In a country that once promised security and opportunity, no one should ever feel that way. That is not the Canada she believed in, and it cannot be the Canada we leave behind.

The budget does not just forget our history; it also disrespects the people who wrote it in blood and sacrifice. Our veterans are facing broken promises too. After putting on the uniform and defending Canada's freedom, they now see that the government is cutting Veterans Affairs by over \$4 billion in the next four years. That is not just a budget line but a betrayal of the people who gave everything for our country.

Budgets are about priorities, and this budget makes them painfully clear. The priorities of the Liberal government are focused on Ottawa insiders, bureaucrats and bankers, all of whom stand to gain. They are not focused on making life affordable for the people in my community of Cambridge or across Canada. It is a split-screen contrast, with working Canadians on one side and the Prime Minister's well-connected friends on the other.

The budget is full of handouts for the Prime Minister's corporate buddies at places like Brookfield. It is going to create new bureaucracies, when businesses are already suffocating under piles of red tape. It is going to ship billions of dollars to wealthy bondholders as the Prime Minister loads up more debt onto the Canadian credit card. It will create higher taxes, more inflation and bigger borrowing costs for everyday people who cannot get by as it is.

Brookfield has been exploring investments in airports. Now we can see, buried on page 100 of budget 2025, a single vague sentence that states, "The government will also consider options for the privatisation of airports." Is that coincidence? Hardly. When we connect the dots of the Prime Minister's interest at Brookfield and the company's interest in airports, it raises serious questions about whose interest the budget really serves.

Let us remember that the Prime Minister was once an executive at Brookfield, one of Canada's largest and most diversified companies, which later moved its headquarters to the U.S. and has been accused of using offshore structures to avoid paying up to \$6 billion in Canadian taxes. The list goes on. In the budget, the finance minister wrote, "We will build new infrastructure and capitalise on projects that further Canada's standing as a clean energy superpower." Which company is one of the largest investors in solar panels and clean energy? It is Brookfield. Which one owns companies that manufacture and install heat pumps? It is Brookfield again.

As of recently, the Prime Minister owned approximately seven million dollars' worth of Brookfield stock. Does anybody believe that with a blind trust in place, the Prime Minister is just going to forget about all that wealth sitting in his portfolio? The only thing growing as fast as Brookfield stocks is our food bank lines.

The Prime Minister's conflicts of interest are costing Canadians, and that is not the only big handout in this budget, which contains billions for subsidies, initiatives, special funds and climate programs, with no performance measures, no timelines and no accountability. It is the same tried and true recipe that gave us a \$1-billion infrastructure bank that built almost no infrastructure, a \$1-billion housing accelerator that built almost no housing, and a \$1-billion green slush fund whose only accomplishment was to send big bonuses to Ottawa bureaucrats.

The government is mortgaging Canadians' future, plain and simple. Canada should be a place where hard work leads to security, not to a future buried in debt. That is the promise my family believed in, and it is the promise millions of Canadians still hold today. We can keep that promise, but only with a government that respects taxpayers, lives within its means and puts Canadians first.

• (1600)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, putting aside the despicable comments the Conservatives have in their speaking notes regarding the Prime Minister, and the character assassination they persist in, I want to pick up on what the member mentioned with regard to the military. How wrong can a member actually be?

At the end of the day, when the leader of the Conservative Party was in the Conservative caucus, military spending fell to less than 1% of GDP. We are now at 2% with the current Prime Minister, and moving far beyond that. We have actually given a 20% increase in pay to Canadian Forces members. These are the things the member opposite votes against. The \$1-billion cutback she is talking about is because of the cost savings on cannabis. Will she not consider her—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cambridge.

Connie Cody: Mr. Speaker, all we hear are paper promises all the time. The budget removes over \$4 billion from Veterans Affairs over the next four years, while veterans continue to face long wait times for disability claims and experience gaps in mental health support and delays in accessing services. That is not my opinion; it is in black and white in the budget. Veterans do not need talking points; they need timely services, mental health support and dignity after their service. Slashing core funding is not progress; it is a broken promise to the people who wore the uniform. If the Liberal government truly values veterans, it should match its words with action, not reductions.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if I understood correctly, my colleague talked about the situation facing one of her constituents, a 75-year old woman who is having trouble making ends meet and who is worried about her health.

I would like to point out that the budget contains no measures to help seniors cope with the cost of living. However, these people are on a fixed income with old age security. At least her 75-year-old constituent got the 10% increase, which is still not enough. A 73-year-old could probably tell the member the same thing. She could tell the member that she cannot make ends meet, that rents are too high and that her old age security is not enough to keep up with in-

Government Orders

flation, not to mention that she did not even get the 10% increase that 75-year-olds got.

Does my colleague not agree that all pensioners should be paid the same amount, starting at age 65? Her party supported my bill in the last Parliament, so let us increase old age security by 10% for seniors aged 65 to 74.

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

[*English*]

Connie Cody: Mr. Speaker, I agree that things are getting tough for everyone. Just today I heard about two more businesses closing in my community because of tariffs and the rising cost of doing business in Canada. These are the facts of the past 10 years of Liberal mismanagement, and it is not going to get better with this budget. Since January, \$61 billion has left Canada, and domestic investors are pouring billions into U.S. markets. When investment leaves, housing projects stall, costs rise and Canadians pay the price.

In Cambridge, families tell me they need affordable homes and good-paying jobs, not more bureaucracy. The Liberals promised a trade deal with the U.S. to protect Canadian workers, and when the Prime Minister was asked about those stalled talks, his response was, "Who cares?" That attitude is disrespectful to Canadians and dismissive of the real struggles people are facing. I cannot support a budget that fails to put Canadians first or to bring back affordability.

• (1605)

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was very touched when I heard the member for Cambridge talk about her grandmother and how, when she came to Canada, her fridge was full of groceries. I thought very long and hard at that moment about the seniors and the mothers in my riding who are struggling to feed their family and to keep the lights and the heat on.

I would ask if the member would take a few moments and share some stories or let us know what her constituents are saying about this budget and the fact that they need an affordable budget, not the kind that has been presented here in the House.

Connie Cody: Mr. Speaker, it is really sad to hear that in my community, the fridges are not full as my grandmother's once was.

Government Orders

What the budget is bringing is more debt, higher taxes and less hope. Families in Cambridge are already skipping meals so their kids can eat. Demand at the Cambridge Food Bank is up 114%, and there are 1,000 new families turning to it for the first time, including people who have full-time jobs.

The budget adds \$321 billion in new debt with no plan to make life affordable. The Liberals call this budget an investment, but it is really generational debt. While families are struggling to pay for groceries, well-connected insiders and former colleagues of the Prime Minister are positioned to profit. We need to listen to Canadians, our families—

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Riding Mountain, Health; the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Employment.

[*English*]

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we heard the Prime Minister in the time before the budget. He said it was going to be a transformational and generational budget, but when he tabled the budget, he failed to address the critical issues that Canadians are facing today: the affordability crisis, the cost of living crisis and unemployment. We have seen the highest unemployment in a decade. There is a failure to deal with the climate crisis and the growing inequality in our country.

I am going to speak about, obviously, the things that we do not like in the budget, things that are missing in the budget and things that we have been working on and have brought forward to the government that are possibly good. There are some things that we hope the government will follow through on.

First, I am going to talk about the cuts to the public service. They are cutting 40,000 public servant jobs. I will give an idea of what that looks like. They started this austerity already. They cut 3,000 jobs at the CRA call centres. Ask anybody in the House what it looks like in our offices right now with the backlog of constituents calling our offices because they simply cannot get through to the CRA. However, the CRA has no problem finding people in this country when they owe it money.

I will give an example. Ryan is a volunteer firefighter in Merville on Vancouver Island. He got chased because he got the new volunteer firefighter tax credit, which I helped fight for, which people in the House supported eventually and which the government adopted, but now the government is chasing Ryan around. Ryan spent his summer fighting wildfires. Can members imagine chasing around a volunteer firefighter, when we know it still has not dealt with the Panama papers and the corporate misuse of the tax system with the tax havens that are out there? Instead, the CRA is spending its time chasing around volunteer firefighters like Ryan.

Imagine a further cut at the CRA. Imagine cuts at Veterans Affairs. We saw the Conservatives cut a third of the staff at Veterans Affairs, and the disability application backlog grew to 50,000. This

is not a time to cut the public service. This is a time to strengthen it, especially as the economy is struggling.

We saw the government do nothing to deal with the corporate greed and the inflation crisis that is happening right now. Whether it be at the pump, at the grocery till or when people are trying to access the Internet or get their basic cellphones covered, those prices are continuing to skyrocket, and also when they go to pay their rent or pay their mortgage. However, last year RBC made a record \$16 billion. Bell made \$6.3 billion. What did they do? They laid off 700 employees. Loblaws made over \$2 billion, and Imperial Oil made almost \$1 billion last quarter and \$5 billion last year. What did they do? They also laid off almost 1,000 employees. That is the corporate responsibility and how it is playing out at the top for Canada's big corporations.

In fact, we have the lowest corporate tax rate in the G7, and what else do we have? We have record profits. Even Conservatives in Britain brought in an excess profit tax when the profits were so out of control, and I want people to win. I want small businesses to win. I want medium-sized businesses to win. I want large businesses to win. We all do, but it cannot be on the backs of everyday people when people struggling and suffering. It cannot be at their expense. It cannot be that they are preyed upon by companies that have control over the markets for the basic needs of everyday Canadians.

What is happening right now in our country is that we are normalizing this out-of-control, raging corporate greed, and this is how it is playing out for everyday Canadians: The gap between the richest two-fifths of Canadians and the poorest two-fifths of Canadians has reached the widest level since Stats Canada started doing the work of recording it and collecting data. It is highlighted that the share of disposable income is primarily due to investment gains. That is what is driving it. This needs to be addressed, and in this budget, the government did nothing to address the corporate runaway greed that is taking place in this country.

• (1610)

Also, when it comes to the climate emergency, we have a climate emergency happening. The government did not invest in a clean energy grid across this country like it could have. That was a generational and transformational opportunity that would have met the Prime Minister's needs. The government failed to do that. Instead, it is focusing on building pipelines that have no plan, no money behind them and no proponents. The Liberals are continuing to bring forward these ideas that failed under the previous Conservative government.

Government Orders

The government killed the greener homes program that was employing contractors and labour right across this country. The government just killed a very successful program, one that was certainly helping reduce emissions.

In terms of housing, the government has still not committed to an amount for co-op non-market housing. As a product of co-op housing, I know what it is like to have safe, secure and affordable housing. The government announced \$13 billion for housing, but it still has not committed a percentage of that to be non-market or a percentage that will be geared to income, with a set amount for the threshold, which should be 30%.

Where are we when it comes to housing? We are at 3.4%. England and France are at about 16% or 17%. Denmark is at 21%. The Netherlands are at 34%. They do not see the homelessness that we see here. They do not see what it looks like at 3.4%. Every MP can go to a centre in their community and see what 3.4% non-market housing looks like. There is homelessness like we have never seen. It is skyrocketing out-of-control homelessness.

These are things that need to be addressed, and the government has failed to do that. There are many things missing. Pharmacare was mentioned, but there is no commitment, despite the fact that the Pharmacare Act passed in the House. However, the Liberals still tout the pharmacare plan that they were going to deliver.

There is no mention of the toxic drug crisis. Over 52,000 Canadians have died from a poisoned drug supply. We have the third-highest death rate per capita in the world from toxic drugs, despite the fact that we have seen other countries like Portugal take a holistic, integrated, coordinated approach to responding to their toxic drug crisis.

On mental health, a Mental Health Commission report says unaddressed mental health issues are costing the Canadian economy \$200 billion a year. This is impacting everybody, everybody in the House, everybody who has a constituent in their riding. Nobody is left untouched by the mental health crisis that is happening. It does not have to be this way. Right now, provincial and territorial governments are spending half what is being spent in the OECD on mental health. It is costing the Canadian economy. This is an economic, nation-building, important investment that needs to happen right across this country. We need parity with mental and physical health, and it needs to be legislated.

There is still no mention of when the government is going to fund the salmon programs that are sunseting at the end of March. Friendship centre agreements sunset in March. They cannot wait for an economic statement.

There is no investment when it comes to ship recycling or ship-building on the west coast, despite the fact that we need capacity. It is absolutely critical. We often hear Conservatives talk about the need for B.C. ferries to be built in this country. The former Conservative finance minister basically said, in 2010, that these ferries should not be built here, and he removed a 25% tariff that was meant to be in place, to be there as a barrier so that ships were built in Canada instead of outside the country. In fact, those ferries were built in Poland. Those ferries should have been built in Canada, and that tariff should never have been removed.

Lastly, I am going to talk about the disability tax credit. Over 250,000 disability tax credit forms were processed in 2022. This amounts to about 250,000 hours of family physicians' time. This was highlighted in the College of Family Physicians of Canada recently. All that has to happen is for the government, instead of investing \$10 million in this budget to help people get \$150 to go pay a doctor to fill out the forms, to say that if a person gets disability in their province or territory, they automatically qualify for the disability tax credit. That would seem to make sense, especially with a health care system that is way beyond capacity.

We need to be innovative. We need to reduce red tape. We need to support people living on disabilities.

● (1615)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his ongoing advocacy and his tax credits for firefighters, for advocating for corporate responsibility and for advocating for the basic needs of everyday Canadians.

However, I also want to address a growing concern for Canadians, and that is the influence of Donald Trump's White House over the Canadian Conservative Party, which is importing trends from the U.S. such as cutting funding for public education, removing environmental standards, the misogynistic manipulation of young men and the vilification of immigrants in the global south. I wonder if the member opposite has any concerns about the increasing influence of Donald Trump over the Canadian Conservative Party and Conservative movements in Canada.

Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, my concern is not about the influence over the official opposition, but over the government. The government is the one who brought in draconian legislation like Bill C-5, which the Conservatives would never even have dreamt of bringing forward. Of course they support it, because they know that it tramples indigenous rights and it overrides provincial governments and their aspirations.

We have continually seen the Liberals run with an agenda that is a Conservative, Trumpian, Republican agenda. I cannot even imagine what has happened to the Liberal Party. Today's announcement on pipelines was a perfect example of trampling rights and responsibility. It is unbelievable to see the government's approach and its failure in its fiduciary responsibility when it comes to first nations people and Canadians.

Government Orders

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for our colleague across the way. We have done a lot of work together on mental health. He spoke about mental health in his intervention. What a garbage question from a Liberal colleague. It just shows they are afraid of actually asking tough questions, because they know what is going to come back to them.

Over 50,000 Canadians have died in the opioid crisis since 2016. It is a generational crisis, yet there is not one mention of it in this budget. I would like to hear my hon. colleague's comments on that.

Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, who has been working closely with me on mental health issues for many years. We both understand that the Canadian government has a document for a Canadian substitute strategy. It says we have a coordinated, integrated, compassionate approach, but guess what. There is no plan with a timeline and no money behind it. It means nothing without that, absolutely nothing. It is pie in the sky. What the government needs to do is roll out a plan.

The government had an auto theft summit. I am not saying auto theft is not important, but the fact that the government has never had a summit on the toxic drug crisis demonstrates the stigma right there. It demonstrates the stigma of the government not seeing this crisis as the crisis it truly is. It is the leading cause of death under the age of 59 in my home province of British Columbia. The federal government has failed to lead when it comes to tackling this crisis that is affecting people right across this country.

● (1620)

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, the member for Courtenay—Alberni is denouncing cuts to the public service, profits made by big grocery chains, oil subsidies, and inaction on the housing crisis and on homelessness. Where was he on November 17 during the deciding vote on the budget? He abstained.

Today he is denouncing a budget that does nothing to resolve the problems he is talking about. I am trying to understand. Usually in politics, when a person says one thing and does another, we call that inconsistency. This is what makes people more cynical about politicians and democratic institutions.

I would like my colleague to explain how he can denounce something today that he let pass on November 17.

[*English*]

Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, clearly this was not an NDP budget. I promised I would go home and listen to the constituents. I talked to all nine mayors in my riding, three regional district chairs and 17 elected chief councillors in my riding. All of them were unanimous in that they said not to vote against the budget and not to bring down the government. That was what they said, although almost all of them opposed this budget.

This is like Stephen Harper in 2005, Jack Layton in 2006 and Ignatieff and Dion, when they abstained to not bring down the government right after an election because they were told by Canadians that Canadians did not want an election. In fact, they told us to work together. That is what I heard from my constituents and that is what we need to start doing more of here.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was more than five years ago that the federal government launched its so-called safe supply. It was more than five years ago that it decided the answer to this growing drug crisis was to use federal taxpayer dollars to expand access to hard drugs, not treatment, not recovery and not healing, just drugs.

After a half a decade of chaos and heartbreak and \$1 billion spent, what did the Liberals decide to do? In this budget, they chose to walk away. They chose to let mental health and addiction support funding expire, with no plan to renew it, no plan to replace it and no plan to help Canadians who are living through the consequences of the policies the Liberals championed. They are passing the responsibility to the provinces and municipalities, claiming it is not their jurisdiction. They should have had that same mindset before starting the safe supply experiment. They are pretending their decisions had nothing to do with the crisis Canadians are facing today. The government set fire to the barn, and now it is walking away hoping for someone else to put out the flames.

The human toll of this drug crisis is being borne in large part by those we ask to save lives: our first responders. Recent reporting from CityNews shows the scale of what they are facing. The Vancouver Fire Rescue Services recently answered 54 overdose incidents in one day, the highest number of overdose responses ever recorded by that department. These are not rare, isolated events. In 2024, the average was between 20 and 25 daily overdose calls. In the Waterloo region, we just had to put out an overdose safety awareness alert this week.

Meanwhile, an article from Canadian Affairs showcases what paramedics, firefighters and other frontline workers, like our nurses, are describing as their mental health and moral injury trauma, not from overdoses but from the endless cycle of drug-related emergencies they are powerless to resolve. One paramedic candidly described attending calls day after day for the same individuals, often without any resources to offer any long-term help.

Government Orders

These are not merely medical emergencies; these are social emergencies rooted in addiction, homelessness and untreated mental illness, yet first responders regularly arrive at scenes where there is nowhere safe to send people, no capacity for long-term treatment and no effective wraparound supports. There is no durable strategy from the federal government to address the root causes. Essentially, we are sending paramedics and firefighters to fight a crisis that requires structural solutions while giving them nothing but repetition, burnout and trauma. Addictions and mental health are mentioned exactly once in this budget, only to say the funding is ending.

Another vulnerable group being affected by this crisis is our youth. They are now suffering deeply from this drug crisis. The data shows the trend is worsening. Even the CBC has recently reported that doctors in London, Ontario, are seeing alarming numbers of youth, some as young as early teens, using opioids and other substances. Another CityNews report highlights that non-medical prescription opioid use among students jumped 10% in two years.

Given all that, does it make sense for the solution to be funding opioids with taxpayer dollars? Given this information, the common-sense solution would be to crack down on illicit drug networks and use taxpayer dollars to help fund abstinence-based recovery treatment. We are witnessing rising drug use, rising overdose risk and growing addiction among youth, many of whom started using as children, yet we still lack the infrastructure, resources and political will to properly treat them. Addictions and mental health are mentioned exactly once in this budget, only to say the funding is ending.

● (1625)

The scale of loss in Canada's drug crisis defies comprehension. According to the federal government's own data, 53,821 Canadians have died from an overdose since 2016. To put that into perspective, Canada lost approximately 45,000 soldiers in World War II. This country has now lost more people to the drug crisis than we lost in the entirety of the Second World War.

Let that sink in. Let us think about this. A global conflict that spanned continents and years took fewer Canadian lives than drugs, untreated addiction and government failure, and despite the staggering loss and the fact that we are losing more Canadians to addiction than one of the deadliest conflicts in our history, the government has chosen to put zero new funding, zero new programs and zero new hope in this budget for mental health and addictions.

Communities are grieving at a wartime scale. Families are burying loved ones at a larger-than-wartime scale, and the federal government is responding with silence. Addictions and mental health are mentioned exactly once in this budget, and that is to say the funding is ending.

These are all national examples of how out of hand this drug crisis has gotten, but unfortunately, my community of Kitchener has not dodged it. This crisis is not abstract to the people of Kitchener. It is lived daily.

Our downtown core, once vibrant, busy and safe, is struggling. Small businesses are reporting lower foot traffic, rising theft, property damage and incidents that make customers and staff feel unsafe. Restaurants, cafés and shops told me directly that patronage is

down because people no longer feel comfortable bringing their families downtown.

These small businesses are not just storefronts; they are jobs, community anchors and part of what makes our cities home. They are asking for leadership from the federal government. They are asking for mental health supports, treatment options and real solutions, not half measures and not abandonment, yet addictions and mental health are mentioned exactly once in this budget, and that is to say the funding is ending.

I have had numerous constituents write to me echoing the same thing: not feeling safe downtown and feeling disappointed that this is what has become of their once vibrant and safe community. One wrote to me recently describing what their family faces every day living near Weber Street. They said that every single day, they see something that they are amazed is even allowed in their community. They said just up the road is a hotel filled with homeless individuals, including children, living in conditions where drugs are openly used. They once witnessed a woman shooting up right in front of the window of the Pluto Day Care in broad daylight while children played inside.

Another constituent wrote that after a recent decision allowing the Victoria Street and Weber Street encampment to remain, they have lost all hope in the downtown core. They wonder why they must follow every bylaw, shovel their walkway and keep their property safe and clean while others' rights extend beyond theirs. What about the rest of Kitchener citizens? They ended with some sentences that no Canadian should ever have to say. They said this has become their new normal. They said this is downtown and they want to feel safe again. They do not know why their family does not matter anymore.

Let me be clear. This is not the fault of people struggling with addictions and mental illness. They are Canadians in pain, deserving of compassion, treatment and a real chance at recovery. However, the families in Kitchener, families watching their community deteriorate, are feeling unheard and abandoned.

Government Orders

The government set fire to the barn, and now it is walking away hoping for someone else to put out the flames. Well, I am proud to stand here and say that Conservatives will step up and put out the flames. I am here to tell Canadians that they do not have to suffer and that there is hope in abstinence-based rehabilitation. The Conservative plan offers a clear path out of this: end the failed experiment of safe supply and take the billions we are spending to perpetuate misery and invest it into 50,000 real treatment beds, medical detox and recovery housing.

We owe our youth more than safe supply and body bags. We owe our first responders more than burnout and despair. We owe the 53,000 already lost more than just a budget announcing that it is going to end. Every Canadian life is worth fighting for, and it is time to bring Canadians home drug-free.

• (1630)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I appreciate the member's passion on the issue, but I would ask her to reflect on what the Conservative Party, as a political entity, actually says and does inside the House.

This is a government that has worked with different jurisdictions, whether on the crime file or on the issue of overdoses, and we continue to do that. We have provided strong leadership through financial support and through working with and supporting provincial and municipal initiatives. We have received virtually universal support on our legislation dealing with crime. It seems the only people who oppose the initiatives that municipalities, provinces and the federal government are doing in a co-operative—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener Centre.

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, as a proud Conservative standing in this House, I will reflect on what we will do about this drug crisis. A billion dollars has already been spent by the government, only to perpetuate the problem. As a Conservative, I stand here today to say we will focus on recovery, we will focus on rehabilitation and we will take the lead and do what is right for Canadians in this country.

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for addressing the concerns that Canadians face across the nation. I know, coming from British Columbia, that many British Columbians face the same mental health and drug crisis situations that her constituents face. I want to know if she can elaborate and expand in detail on those situations and stories.

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is right that this is a nationwide crisis. This is not just on my doorstep; it is on the doorstep of every single of us sitting in this House.

When I was speaking with people when I was door knocking in my community, I do not think there was one family I talked to that was not affected, either directly or indirectly, by the drug crisis. That is just in my community. I know that every single one of the seats in this House represents communities that are the same. We need to start doing something about this.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my Conservative colleague for her speech, which was clearly based on her convictions and came from the heart. I appreciated it.

While the member was giving her speech, another speech was being delivered that we could describe as also coming from the heart: Minister Guilbeault announced his resignation as minister—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the member to remind him that he is not to use the name of a member in the House.

The hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear my colleague's reaction.

[*English*]

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, I just heard about that this second, but I would like to focus on the drug crisis in this country because it is always overshadowed by other stories and other things happening.

We have to talk about this drug crisis, and we have to take the lead and focus on rehabilitation to bring our loved ones home happy, healthy and drug-free.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for showing such passion on a critical issue that is costing the lives of Canadians.

We have heard from chief medical health officers, chief corners, chiefs of police, the First Nations Health Authority and Moms Stop the Harm. They have all been consistent in saying that we need to get politicians out of the way. We need to support evidence-based and expert-led policy, not ideology, and we need to move rapidly.

Does my colleague agree that it is time for politicians to get out of the way? In Portugal, that is the big success story. Politicians got out of the way, and they supported the experts in implementing a policy that supported treatment on demand, recovery, prevention and drug replacement therapy. This was led by experts, not politicians. They got out of the way, but they had a plan with a timeline and they put in the resources to take on the crisis. They went from over 1,000 people dying to 70 people dying each year, so we know we can do it—

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

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, we need to work together. All governments need to work together to find a solution to this crisis. It is the Liberal government that has perpetuated this crisis, though, and it put \$1 billion into making it worse.

We need to focus on rehabilitation and recovery. I agree completely with what the member is saying, but I also think we all need to collaborate and work together to find solutions, real solutions, rehabilitative solutions, for our citizens—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech, I want to point out that, with both pride and sadness, I am wearing a white ribbon to mark the 12 days of action to end violence against women, ending on December 6. I believe that next week, we will have a day to make speeches as part of a ministerial statement. It is important that we remember these women who were murdered in cold blood in 1989 simply because they were women and they were empowered.

I thank these gentlemen for talking while I am giving my speech. It is not always easy to make speeches when we feel that our colleagues do not respect us, that they do not listen, but above all, that they speak over us. I appreciate the intervention, Mr. Speaker.

We are here to discuss Bill C-15, the budget implementation bill. I will say that I feel like speaking from the heart because this may be the first time in my career as a member of Parliament that I am totally confident I did the right thing by voting against the current government's budget. There is absolutely nothing in it that reflects my constituents' concerns.

People are trying to figure out who hit the budget jackpot. I will certainly talk about the big winners, but there are more losers than winners. My colleague from Shefford has done an outstanding job as our party's critic for seniors for the past six years, and she has taken every opportunity to point out that the Liberal government has been leaving seniors out in the cold since 2015. I, too, make a point of saying that.

We cannot fathom why the government did not allocate a penny of this budget to boosting old age security for people aged 65 to 74, despite their declining buying power. This is an injustice; it is ageism. The government is acting as though 65-year-olds do not have a hard time putting a roof over their heads or food on the table.

People who receive old age security and the guaranteed income supplement have less than \$2,000 a month to live on. The vast majority of them have no private pension fund, no RRSP and no savings to help them. The food bank in my riding has also noticed an increase in requests for food assistance from people aged 65 and over, which is unacceptable. How can we treat our founders this way? They are the ones who built the Quebec of today. It is unacceptable, and I will not hesitate to repeat it at every opportunity.

Another injustice is the whole issue of employment insurance. In 2028, a measure will come into effect concerning special benefits for people grieving the death of a loved one, a child, but that will not happen until 2028. Why wait? Why not bring that measure in right away. A bill on this very issue was introduced last week.

Government Orders

That said, there is nothing to remedy this kind of injustice, this discrimination against women, especially those who are mothers and who, if they lose their job after their maternity leave, are unable to collect any employment insurance benefits because they obviously did not accumulate any hours of work while they were on maternity leave. As far as I know, no man can give birth, and therefore no man can say that he is giving birth in order to get maternity leave.

I find it hard to understand why the government is not taking advantage of this budget, which deals with a million things and is 600 pages long, to include a small line to correct this injustice, this discrimination against women who lose their jobs during maternity leave and who cannot get employment insurance if the position they held is eliminated, for example. It is truly unacceptable.

Who, then, are the big winners in this budget? The big winners are the oil companies. The entire fossil fuel sector is a big winner in this budget, and why is that? Well, let us talk about the backsliding. There are plenty of examples of backsliding. Since the Liberals were re-elected, we have seen one example after another.

• (1640)

Regarding the environment, Environment and Climate Change Canada's budget has been cut by up to 15%. Nature-based programs will be cut by \$245 million. Liquefied natural gas production could double. There is also the Pathways Plus project. Today, a new pipeline was announced, even though British Columbia and indigenous nations do not want it. That does not matter, because there is a new law on the books that allows the government to circumvent the rules and laws put in place by the provinces, and even those of the Parliament of Canada. Obviously, that is unacceptable.

It is so unacceptable that the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture has resigned. That is right; he resigned today. He is known as a great environmentalist. When he was minister of environment and climate change, some progress was made. Unfortunately, since the return of the new Liberal government, well, there has been some backsliding. There has been so much backsliding that a minister in the current government has resigned over it. I want to highlight that courageous act, because when you have convictions, you have to stand up for them. The minister probably realized that there is no way to move forward with the current government in place. This position in favour of oil companies and fossil fuels is unlikely to change as long as this government is in power, which is very sad.

Government Orders

On Monday, three UQAM communications students came to my constituency office to meet with me. They were working on a university project that involved creating a podcast, and they chose the environment as their topic. They asked me such great questions. These 18-year-old students, who are just starting their university studies, told me that it seems so obvious to them that we need to disengage from the fossil fuel sector, and they asked me why that was not happening. It was such an excellent question that I want to ask it too. The issue is complex, but they are right. It is all too obvious that we need to disengage from fossil fuels, move on to climate adaptation and find ways to further reduce our environmental footprint.

I told them that some sectors, individuals and businesses get more of the government's attention than others because they have more resources. That is not to say that all is lost, but it does mean that we need to speak up more loudly and voice our convictions more forcefully, because the fossil fuel and nuclear energy sectors have a lot of influence on this government and close ties with it. These students were surprised to hear me say that they were obviously right, but that this sector has had the government's ear for years.

The budget allocates several billion dollars in tax credits and other types of credits to this sector. If there is one sector that is not struggling and that is raking in billions of dollars in profits every year, it is the oil sector. The students had a hard time understanding why, for example, the government has promised to build a pipeline to British Columbia's Pacific coast, in an area with impressive biodiversity. Everyone knows about it; it is well documented. It is going to happen even if British Columbia opposes it. To them, it is obvious, and they wonder how this can happen. These are political games to score points, even if it means jeopardizing a wonderfully biodiverse environment that is carefully protected by an indigenous nation. These are political games to gain support in Alberta. I find this scandalous, and these students are right to have talked to me about it and to have asked these questions.

I will wrap up, even though I could talk for hours about what upsets me about this budget, but before I do, there is one last thing that I want to share. For several years now, I have been fighting to have small fruit producers who make alcohol from pears, currants or blueberries exempt from the excise tax. They are currently not exempt, but those who produce apple cider and mead are. That is thanks to the work of the member for Joliette—Manawan, who fought for this measure at the Standing Committee on Finance three years ago. However, there is something we do not understand. The current Minister of Finance and National Revenue represents a riding that includes rural areas. He is a Quebecker. He knows full well that artisans who produce a few thousand bottles of pear cider are not competing with international producers. They should be exempt from the excise tax.

• (1645)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to ask my colleague whether she believes that seniors' benefits remain the most important social program in the federal budget, ahead of the Canada health transfer and the Canada child benefit.

This is an important part of Canada's transfer system and the benefit system for our seniors. Also, are seniors not happy to now have access to the Canadian dental care plan?

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. This gives me a chance to tell her that seniors are indeed happy that their dental care is cheaper. However, can they really pay for fillings if they do not have the money to pay the rent or buy groceries?

I do not think the member understands that the old age security pension and the guaranteed income supplement are universal programs and that the Liberals have consciously created a distinction between seniors aged 65 to 74 and those over 75. That is unacceptable.

She should not stand for that. She should try to make her government aware of this discrimination, which is completely unacceptable.

[*English*]

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the luxury tax on yachts and private jets, which have a huge carbon footprint, is gone, but the tax on work trucks that farmers and tradespeople use is still around. Does the member believe, as I do, that this budget is written for Bay Street billionaires? The farmers and tradespeople who keep this country fed and running are once again left holding the bag.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural region where there are many produce growers and many people who farm grains, fruits, vegetables, corn and soybeans. Frankly, this budget does not take into account our farmers' reality at all. It does not offer them the support they require or programs tailored to their needs.

Canada-wide programs do not work in agriculture because production in the east and west are different. With climate change, we would have expected the government to be more responsive to all of our producers in the budget.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am going to pick up on a question about seniors that the member for Guelph put to my colleague. I would like to note that I am a bit surprised by this lack of sensitivity. In the last Parliament, the bill to increase old age security for seniors aged 65 to 74 received unanimous support. Even the Liberals voted for it. Everyone acknowledged that indexing the pension was no longer enough and that people on fixed incomes could no longer make ends meet because of inflation.

We have been talking about food banks, where more and more seniors are asking for help. Just before the budget was tabled, the Fédération de l'Âge d'Or du Québec, or FADOQ, told me that its members are no longer able to make ends meet, so this budget has to do something for seniors.

Government Orders

During our constituency week, I spoke with the Association québécoise de défense des droits des personnes retraitées et pré-retraitées, or AQDR, which advocates for the rights of people who are retired or approaching retirement. I talked with its representatives. Things are not working anymore. They want us to bring this issue forward again. They do not understand why this government cares so little about the seniors who built Quebec.

What are my colleague's thoughts on that?

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and commend her for her dedication to the plight of seniors. The Bloc Québécois is lucky to have her. She gives a voice to seniors in the House of Commons. If not for the Bloc, no one would be talking about seniors here.

To answer her question, seniors talk to us in our ridings. Twenty per cent of my constituents are seniors aged 65 and over. Quebec and British Columbia have highest aging rates in Canada. Some seniors have worked their entire lives and yet they cannot afford their rent. There is not enough social housing or low-cost housing. When we see that we wonder if the same thing is happening in our riding.

I am little surprised by my colleague opposite's insensitivity when it comes to the plight of seniors. I think that more detailed discussions on that topic would be worthwhile to improve his knowledge.

[*English*]

Terry Dowdall (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the great people of Simcoe—Grey to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation act.

When the budget was announced, I, like many of my constituents, was shocked that the so-called new Liberal government could spend even more than the so-called old Liberal government.

What a decade it has been. Almost every facet of Canadian life has declined. Our young people find it harder to get work and many have given up on ever owning a home. Previously, middle-class families were able to save a little to get ahead and now they struggle just to get by. Seniors, especially single ones, who rely on CPP and OAS to get by are spending their golden years in poverty. Every crime indicator has increased. Homeless encampments are everywhere. Illegal drug use is rampant. Housing prices have recently cooled but still remain near all-time highs. It is great for those who own a home, but a disaster for those who dream of owning one themselves. Therefore, people rent, but rent too takes up more of their monthly budget than it ever has before.

If everyone was being totally honest, I do not believe anyone in this place could say that, for the majority of Canadians, life has improved in the last 10 years.

When constituents write to me, call my offices or speak to me at many events, they often raise these issues. As we all know in this place, constituents raise many issues, but if I were to group them into categories, then I would say that cost of living is by far the most common issue I hear about. The issue that most affects cost of living is just how expensive food is. We are not just talking about organic, imported, deluxe foods. We are talking about basic Canadian staples, like beef, bread and vegetables.

I know we have heard some of these numbers in the chamber before, but let us have a quick recap. As of October 2025, here are the year-to-year price increases: Fresh or frozen beef is up 16.8%. Fresh or frozen chicken is up 6.2%. Apples are up 4.2%, and carrots are up 11%. These are just a few examples.

The irony is that much of this food is produced in Canada, including in my riding, Simcoe—Grey. The local producers of this food are not seeing profits increasing at the same rate that prices are rising in grocery stores. A recent report indicated that a full 80.6% of Canadians say food is their top expense pressure, a shocking 28% of Canadians use their savings or borrow money just to buy their food, and a quarter of Canadians are experiencing food insecurity.

That is a key term the government likes to use. In fact, it is one of the government's key arguments as to why Canada now needs a national school food program. Let us leave aside the fact that the only reason Canada would ever need a school food program is that so many Canadians have become poorer under the government that they now have difficulty feeding their children healthy food. There have been initiatives in the past in less affluent areas of the country, where school breakfasts or lunch programs existed to address certain challenges. A national school food program means that kids going hungry is now a national problem, after 10 years of Liberal fiscal mismanagement. If Liberals want to push a national school food program, they are certainly welcome to it, but when doing so, they should acknowledge that this is not a generous initiative; it is an attempt to fix a problem that, quite simply, they created.

I am not here to debate the proposed national school program, but I do want to bring attention to the Liberals' vision for the program, as outlined in Bill C-15, under division 44, proposed paragraph 5(a):

the Government of Canada's vision is that all children and youth in Canada have access to nutritious food at school, in an inclusive and non-stigmatizing setting that fosters healthy practices, through school food programs that strengthen connections with local food systems, the environment and culture;

Government Orders

I want to draw members attention to the two points in that quote. The first is access to nutritious food. Whether the government is using Canadian tax dollars to provide kids at school food or parents are using their own money to provide it at home, I think everyone here would agree that access to nutritious food is number one. The second point is the connection to local food systems, the environment and culture. I know that in Simcoe—Grey, we really live by those words. The local food scene is incredible. I do not know if anyone has ever tried it, but I imagine that one could go a year eating only food grown in my riding of Simcoe—Grey.

• (1655)

All the major meats, soy, grains, vegetables, apples, berries and milk are produced in Simcoe—Grey. Many producers go back generations, and some even to the 1800s, with generation after generation of farm families producing the healthy foods we enjoy, all while ensuring the environment remains clean, the soil rich and our water pristine. When the government talks about nutrition and strong connections to the local food system, the environment and culture, those are words we really agree upon.

That is why it is so difficult for me and so many residents of Simcoe—Grey to understand what the government is doing in Clearview Township, one of the communities in my riding. Back in July, my office was notified by the Minister of National Defence and DND that it had purchased 711 acres of prime agricultural land, which it plans to strip down to build one of the Arctic over-the-horizon radar projects right now.

Do not get me wrong, a Liberal government taking an interest in defence once again is a good thing. The proposed pay raise for the men and women in uniform is one of the positives in the budget. Simcoe—Grey is very proud of our Canadian Forces Base Borden. In fact, the proposed radar site is only about 10 or so kilometres from Base Borden.

I want to stress that no one in Simcoe—Grey is opposed to updating Canada's radar system, but they are very concerned about the proposed location and what it entails for our local farming community. Many residents found out about this radar project when they received a letter in the mail from DND asking to buy their land. That is right. It is building a radar site next door, but this is only phase one. It will also build phase two, and the government wants their land to do it. Imagine the reaction from local landowners. Many reached out to my office with questions and concerns.

To the minister's credit, he did provide some information to my office. DND even hosted two jam-packed town halls, both on the same day; we wanted more meetings. Here is where we are at. DND intends to proceed with phase one of the project even without securing land for phase two, which it will not be able to do because no one wants to sell the farms that have been in their families for generations. The government will need to expropriate farmers to get the land, and we are not just talking about a couple of small farms. When phase two is completed, it is estimated that 4,000 acres of Canada's most prime farmland will be taken out of our national ecosystem. This is prime farmland that produces an array of foodstuffs.

To put it in perspective for Canadians, I had some of the affected landowners in my riding put together some numbers of what will be

lost if the government follows through with this project. On an annual basis, Canada will lose the production of 820,000 bushels of corn, which would make 300 million 12-inch tortillas or 50 million boxes of Corn Flakes; 196,000 bushels of soybeans, which is 258,000 gallons of soybean oil or 8.6 million pounds of protein; 368,000 bushels of wheat, which makes 15.4 million pounds of flour, seven million loaves of bread or 15.4 million one-pound boxes of pasta; and 14 million pounds of canola, which produces 789,000 gallons of canola oil or eight million pounds of canola meal. Add to that 185,000 pounds of beef, 700,000 pounds of chicken and 2,500 pounds of pork.

These are huge numbers. It is astounding to me and to so many people in Simcoe—Grey that at a time when the government is talking about food costs, food security and the importance of nutritious local food, the government would simultaneously be proposing to take all this nutritious, local food out of the national food supply. There must be another site for this project in southern Ontario that meets the criteria. The criteria is remote land, flat land, few environmental constraints, distance and close to electrical power. We do not believe eliminating 4,000 acres of prime farmland and destroying generational farm families' livelihoods is the process.

The government needs to realize that jeopardizing food security in the name of national security is not the way to go. I encourage the government to scratch its plans for Clearview Township and investigate the other sites we have proposed in order to not affect and reduce national food security.

I want to thank Rachel Brooks and Terri Jackman for all the work they are doing on this.

• (1700)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did a very quick Google search on a comment the member made. It said the year-over-year price of chicken in Canada has seen an increase of approximately 1.5% according to the consumer price index, though other sources report higher wholesale retail prices. It goes on to give a bit more of an explanation. The member had indicated that it was a price increase of 6.2%.

Now, I am not saying that this particular Google search is right on the mark, but is the member absolutely confident in the percentages that he has been using?

Terry Dowdall: Mr. Speaker, I am not here to split hairs, by any means, but those are the numbers that we got through our research, which is number one.

At the end of the day, if the member opposite went to a grocery store, I think he would probably find those numbers are realistic. I often go to the grocery store and things are up even more than that. That is the average that we found. I believe those are the answers.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a hard-working member. His riding is adjacent to mine. He is well-respected in his community. I know he works hard.

I know he is dealing with an issue that I am keeping an eye on. He referenced the DND expropriation of almost 4,000 acres of farmland. This is prime agricultural land. There are generational family farms. The Simcoe County Federation of Agriculture is engaged, trying to do everything it can to stop this.

Could the member comment a little further? Obviously, when land is expropriated, people do not get the true value for it, and all the significant investments that farmers have made in that area will be lost as well.

• (1705)

Terry Dowdall: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is also a hard worker. He knows, and it is what I have heard, that these farming communities have no interest in selling. These farming communities have grown through the years, through generations. They have a lot of equipment. I do not know what happens when it comes to the expropriation process, but what I can say is that these individuals have absolutely zero interest in selling.

He is correct. Many organizations have reached out, and they are not against. I want to stress that no one is against the actual radar system and what we are doing in the military. We are very proud. There are other organizations, including the beef producers and the Simcoe County Federation of Agriculture, that have sent letters. Neighbouring municipalities have as well. I know Innisfil, which is in the member's riding, Clearview Township, the host municipality, and Mayor Measures have been against the location and the site. As well, Essa Township and, just the other day, the Township of Springwater, all within the Simcoe County, have opposed this particular location.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not think I would be saying this today, but it is a topsy-turvy world, or rather, a topsy-turvy pipeline. We just found out that the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture has resigned. He is the former minister of environment and climate change, for those who still believe climate change exists.

We know that one side is not so sure it exists and the other side, the side of the government and the Liberal Party, is really starting to have doubts, and rightly so. The Liberals are adopting not one pipeline, but two. Trans Mountain cost \$34 billion, and now we are talking about a new pipeline that will cost roughly \$20 billion.

I wonder if the Conservatives regret not voting for the budget. The Liberals are doing exactly what the Conservatives wanted, in

Government Orders

other words, more oil, more oil and gas development, and a new pipeline. Does my colleague agree with what the government is doing? Does he agree with giving the green light to a new pipeline and investing billions more in fossil fuels?

[*English*]

Terry Dowdall: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not regret voting against this budget. My concerns were with the deficit, the expenses and the amount of money. We hear those numbers and stats, that the interest payments are more than the transfers to health care and more than the GST we collect. I am not upset with my objection, because I care about the next generations.

When it comes to the pipeline, my opinion is that we need to get our resources to market. I am not surprised that one of the members from the Liberal Party resigned. I actually thought last term that it would have been a lot more, because they would have realized what they were doing to this country.

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 is a concrete, ambitious budget that is deeply focused on the needs of families on the north shore. In an unstable international context where our supply chains and businesses are facing strong pressures, our government is choosing to make significant investments to reduce the cost of living, modernize our infrastructure and strengthen our economy.

In Thérèse-De Blainville, that means directly investing in our roads, municipal networks and community centres, providing real support for housing, creating more jobs for our young people and expressing clear support for our small and medium-sized manufacturers, which are the economic heart of the region. I know that local mayors are thrilled with this budget and are ready to work with us to capitalize on it.

In terms of infrastructure, the budget allocates \$115 billion to accelerate infrastructure projects. These are unprecedented investments: \$57 billion for public transit and green infrastructure, \$22 billion for community infrastructure and \$16 billion for energy efficiency. In Thérèse-De Blainville, this means that Sainte-Thérèse, Blainville, Lorraine, Bois-des-Filion and Terrebonne will finally be able to implement long-awaited projects, such as upgrading roads and water systems, adding bike paths and building community, cultural and sports centres. The projects are there, and we want our beautiful region to reap the benefits. These investments will support thousands of skilled jobs in our region and improve the quality of life for our families.

Government Orders

Families on the north shore are feeling the pressure of the cost of living. That is the truth. Budget 2025 provides direct answers. There is a tax cut for 22 million Canadians, representing up to \$420 per person and \$840 for a couple. Automatic payment of federal benefits will help up to 5.5 million people receive the amounts they are entitled to. Canada's national school food program will provide 400,000 additional meals to children, saving a family with two children approximately \$800 per year. For our young families, this is immediate and essential relief.

There are wonderful organizations and tremendous leaders in Thérèse-De Blainville, where everyone works together to take care of one another. The leaders of these organizations took the time to tell me how important the budget is to them in terms of providing solutions. Once again, they are ready to work with us to improve quality of life in our riding.

Now I want to talk about housing. In a rapidly growing region like Thérèse-De Blainville, housing is a top priority. The budget invests \$25 billion over five years to accelerate residential construction. This includes \$9 billion for Build Canada Homes; eliminating the GST on the purchase of new homes up to \$1 million, which could mean a savings of up to \$50,000; and more than \$573 million per year in loans for affordable rental buildings. Thanks to these measures, our regional developers will be able to build faster and our municipalities will be able to densify around transit stations to meet mobility needs.

There is so much potential for growth in the region. Of course, public transit must go hand in hand with housing, since traffic congestion is an issue in our region. We need to find solutions for public transit while developing affordable housing. That is why we have funding set aside for infrastructure. It is why we will work with cities to find solutions while investing in affordable housing for our seniors, our young people and our families.

• (1710)

Let us talk about our SMEs and the local economy. What a wonderful topic. Our SMEs are the economic engine of Thérèse-de-Blainville. The 2025 budget offers them robust support with \$10 billion in loans for businesses affected by U.S. tariffs, a superdeduction of up to 125% for automation and \$40 billion in additional cash flow through tax payment deferral. Companies like Enertec Rail Equipment, Miratech and Novatech will be able to modernize their facilities, invest in productivity and protect quality jobs. This is direct support for more than 3,500 jobs in our region. Even as we derive economic strength from our SMEs and make investments in major projects across Canada, we must also promote the francophonie and enable SMEs to connect with the francophone network across Canada. We have to leverage the strength of the francophonie and Canada's two official languages as incredible assets for attracting investment.

Budget 2025 delivers the goods for youth, who are so important: 100,000 jobs under the Canada summer jobs program, 20,000 youth receiving support through the youth employment and skills strategy and an additional 55,000 work placements. That is significant. In Thérèse-de-Blainville, where so many students are looking for their first job experience, these programs are opening doors in a real and lasting way. I am well aware of the challenges confronting our

young people, who are currently grappling with a digital transformation that is affecting the types of jobs available, not to mention the uncertainty caused by the United States in recent months that has kept businesses from investing. Our budget is completely responsible. It sends a strong message to our SMEs that the time has come to invest in productivity and competitiveness again and to grow our place in the world.

Seniors are very important in my riding. Protecting our seniors is essential. Budget 2025 creates the first national anti-fraud strategy, which includes a mandatory code of conduct for banks and a new agency to combat financial crimes that will be operational in 2026. In a region where our seniors are too often targeted, this strengthened framework will allow us to take effective action against financial exploitation. Seniors are also asking us to provide them with opportunities for physical exercise. We talk about the importance of mental health in ending social isolation. We need to invest in infrastructure, and that is what we have done for seniors. I am already working with people in towns and cities to find the best infrastructure for seniors, including for their quality of life.

Culture is the heart and soul of our cities. Budget 2025 invests \$770 million to support local festivals, major events, local media and, of course, the CBC/Radio-Canada. For Thérèse-de-Blainville, where libraries, broadcasters and festivals play an essential role, these investments are a breath of fresh air and will provide concrete support for the cultural vitality of the north shore. We have a golden opportunity right now to put our Canadian pride on full display. I am a proud Quebecker and a proud Canadian. Culture is important, and I am very proud that our government has chosen to invest in culture in this budget, which is so strategic for our constituents.

The budget supports workers with \$3.7 billion in income assistance for those affected by trade tensions, as well as a national online training platform. This means more tools for workers, more retraining, and a stronger partnership with regional unions such as the FTQ, the CSN, and Unifor. In Thérèse-de-Blainville, people tell me they are tired of parties that criticize everything but offer nothing. Budget 2025 provides more assistance for families, more housing, more infrastructure, more jobs for young people, and more support for small and medium-sized enterprises.

• (1715)

[English]

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people all the way from Golden in the Rockies, through the Shuswap and right through to Kamloops have told me that the current Liberal government is worse than the last for its projected deficits. Canadians are now going to be paying more in debt service costs than we are going to be spending on health care transfers. This is like racking up credit card debt to the point where one cannot afford the monthly essentials like health care.

Government Orders

How can the member opposite look people in the eye, especially young people, and tell them, “It’s okay; your generation and future generations are going to have to pay back the debt that we are taking from you right now”?

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette: Mr. Speaker, I can look my constituents and my children and grandchildren in the eye.

This is not a credit card budget, as the Conservatives like to call it. It is a budget that offers ways to find money to improve the quality of life of Canadians, while making investments in the future. When I put money in my children’s TFSA and in programs, I know I am investing in their future. That is exactly what we are doing. We are investing in everyone’s future.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief, but I want to make three points.

By the way, we do not say “our seniors” because seniors do not belong to anyone. I invite my colleague to stop using the term “our seniors”. We say “seniors”.

First, how can they boast about helping seniors by pointing to the New Horizons for Seniors program without any consideration for the fact that seniors’s pockets are empty and that their OAS is not indexed to allow them to cope with the cost of living? There was no increase for seniors 65 to 74.

Second, how can they boast about helping local media when they are satisfied with the local journalism initiative and investments in Radio-Canada while completely abandoning community media and private media?

Third, how can they boast about helping businesses? No one is talking about it, but the government did not respond to their request to address the labour shortage. They asked for a grandfather clause for temporary foreign workers. This is an important request back home.

What does my colleague think about that?

• (1720)

Madeleine Chenette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her many questions.

My colleague may be right about using the words “our seniors”, but I am so fond of the seniors in my riding, and I care about them as though they were part of our extended family. Seniors have my utmost respect.

I have had some very good discussions with seniors, who ask me loads of questions. They understand very well that our budget includes measures to improve their quality of life, to help them with the cost of living and to put infrastructure in place to support them. They also know very well that they are not a homogeneous group. Some people are more vulnerable than others, and seniors agree that we should invest in programs that help the most vulnerable members of our society.

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for her eloquence and the way she summarized the budget. This budget allows us to invest in a systemic package that includes housing, transportation, infrastructure, SMEs, young

people and older people. I think my colleague summed it up well, but I would like to focus on the issue of infrastructure, particularly social infrastructure.

These investments are not credit card spending, as she explained in response to a member across the way. These one-time and recurring investments can be a driver of job creation, which we really need in this country. Perhaps my colleague could talk to us about that?

Madeleine Chenette: Mr. Speaker, infrastructure is critically important. Members of Parliament and our cabinet have demonstrated the importance of investing in this infrastructure. We listen to our constituents, our mayors, and our city councilors. They told us that we need to address the infrastructure issue. Infrastructure supports the quality of life of our constituents and creates jobs in the regions, which are so important to them.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Barrie South—Innisfil.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak fast because I have a lot to cover in seven minutes. A lot has been said about the budget implementation act over the last several days. There are a couple of highlights I want to focus on.

The first thing I want to talk about is the deficit. We heard that it is up to \$78 billion. It was supposed to be \$62 billion. The Prime Minister promised a lower debt-to-GDP ratio. He is raising both it and inflation. He promised to spend less. He is spending \$90 billion more, and that works out to about \$5,400 more in inflationary spending per household when families can least afford it. He is adding \$321.7 billion to the federal debt over the next five years. That is more than twice the \$154 billion that Trudeau would have added over the same period.

Let us think about that. Those are staggering numbers, and this is really going to impact affordability for Canadians. It adds \$10 million to our debt every hour, and the federal debt is now \$1.35 trillion. The interest on the debt will be \$55.6 billion for 2025-26, and that is more than the Canadian health transfers of \$54.7 billion. GST revenue is \$54.4 billion, and it amounts to about \$3,360 per Canadian household. The GDP has already grown. It is just getting worse.

I want to spend my time focusing on something that is not in the budget. It is a critical issue for us locally in central Ontario, particularly in the riding that I represent and the riding of the member for Simcoe—Grey, who is sitting behind me right now. We have many members who have an interest in Lake Simcoe and the health of Lake Simcoe.

Private Members' Business

The Canada Water Agency is addressed in the budget. There are minor increases in funding, but one thing that is not in the budget implementation act, nor was it in the budget, is the restoration of the long-standing demand that I have made and members whose ridings surround Lake Simcoe have made. It is about the health, sustainability and viability of that precious crown jewel. There is not one dime allocated toward the health and the protection of Lake Simcoe. I am profoundly disappointed.

We made a commitment to reinstate the Lake Simcoe cleanup fund. There was \$59 million initiated by the Conservative government back under former prime minister Stephen Harper. We saw measurable improvements in Lake Simcoe's health, quality and invasive species, as well as the land restoration surrounding the lake. It was having a dramatic impact. In 2019, the former finance minister came to the shores of Lake Simcoe and promised a restoration of the Lake Simcoe cleanup fund. Conservatives had made a commitment to restore it, and the Liberals have reneged on that offer since then. We have not seen one dime coming to Lake Simcoe.

There was an announcement of some minor funding, but in terms of that protection plan, that dedicated fund for Lake Simcoe, we have not seen it at all. Just two days ago, the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition issued a report on the current health of Lake Simcoe. I will remind members again that it is the largest freshwater lake in Ontario. It is a four-season destination. The economic benefits of Lake Simcoe, as a four-season destination, are hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue. It is generated in businesses, seasonal fishing and cottages. We depend on the lake for many things, not to mention drinking water, which is drawn from that lake as well.

In the report, the coalition talked about the current state of the lake. It talked about phosphorus pollution, fish habitat and fish health. It talked about invasive species. It stated, "Quagga mussels have overtaken zebra mussels; round goby are widespread; starry stonewort is entrenched, though it has gone through 'boom and bust' cycles; and in 2024, water soldier was confirmed near Keswick and Innisfil as a significant emerging threat".

In fact, through a friend of mine, Barry Wiszniowski, I had an opportunity to fly over the lake in his aircraft. We flew over the water soldier that is now permeating and rising above Cook's Bay. It is quite relevant and prevalent in Cook's Bay right now. As an invasive species, it has the potential to create incredible damage.

• (1725)

In its executive summary, the Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition talked about what we see 16 years after the Lake Simcoe protection plan, which was a provincial initiative. It said, "The costs of inaction are mounting. Declining water quality drives higher municipal expenses for stormwater systems, with significant deferred maintenance for stormwater ponds and linear drainage assets". It said that the "watershed remains under significant ecological stress." The report, and the review of the report, talked about the current scientific conditions and the policy trends, and they were asking that Lake Simcoe have a dedicated fund that is directed, again, in a similar way to what the Conservatives had initiated. I think this was early 2012; I am gapping on the date, but there was \$59 million, as I said, that was dedicated towards the Lake Simcoe cleanup fund, so members of the coalition are asking for the restoration of that fund.

Again, as I said, they are asking to "Anchor Lake Simcoe Within the Federal Freshwater Action Plan".

My colleagues and I, in ridings that surround Lake Simcoe, have written numerous environmental ministers. We have written the Prime Minister, pleading with the government to restore the Lake Simcoe cleanup fund, which was a dedicated fund that saw measurable improvements, that put boots on the ground and that worked with the conservation authorities to make sure that the health and vitality of Lake Simcoe was to be protected, not just for now, but for generations to come. It is that critical to our area, and I am disappointed that it is not in the budget.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC) moved that Bill C-230, An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts (debt forgiveness registry), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to rise on behalf of the people of Simcoe North and to advance an issue that has been of great importance to me, which is increasing the level of transparency for taxpayers in Canada.

However, before I begin my remarks, I would like to acknowledge my good colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent—Aki-awenhrahk, who seconded my bill, and the member for Calgary Crowfoot, who followed this issue very closely in previous Parliaments. It is one of simple transparency for taxpayers with respect to writeoffs that the government provides in the form of forgiveness or waivers of debts owing by corporations to the government. Of course, it is not the government's money that it is writing off; it is taxpayer money that the government writes off for these individuals.

I would like to begin my remarks by setting the frame that a few years ago, the member for Calgary Crowfoot identified that there had been a large writeoff to a corporation around 2020, and he was able to ascertain from the CRA the size of the largest writeoff. I think the answer back then was about \$122 million, but we did not know which corporation that was, and we still do not know.

Now the CRA provides even less transparency about its writeoff activities. It will not even disclose to Canadians the largest single writeoff every year. It hides behind the issue of privacy and even subsequent ministers have decided to keep that information private, relying on section 241 of the Income Tax Act and privacy legislation. However, I believe it is a matter of public interest which corporations these are and the reasons they receive waivers, writeoffs or forgiveness of the amounts that they owe the Crown; as I said previously, this is effectively taxpayer money.

While the CRA employs tens of thousands of individuals, many of whom work very hard every day, it focuses on everyday Canadians who work hard and pay their taxes on time or in the correct way; if they miss a payment or instalment or underpay by even a few dollars, the CRA will immediately start charging them interest and try to collect that money right away.

However, there is a process that happens out of sight of the public, behind closed doors, in which the CRA will tell a corporation that it is no longer pursuing the debt that the corporation owes the government. This practice should change.

The bill, if enacted, would require the government, on an annual basis, to provide the names and reasons for which these writeoffs are given to corporations so that the public can see in full light what is happening with their taxpayer dollars.

As I mentioned, it must be very frustrating for regular Canadians to understand that while they work hard and pay their taxes on time, some corporations get a special break from the government. Of course, some corporations may have gone bankrupt, or there may be other reasons they cannot pay; however, the fact is that this information is still kept secret from the public. It is in the public interest to understand why this is happening.

I would also like to commend some work being done in the Senate. Senator Downe has led some great work in the Senate with respect to greater transparency for the CRA. I believe that the current bill complements a bill that he has moving through that chamber, which would help identify the tax gap and report to Parliament the amounts of money that the CRA thinks it should collect every year versus what it does collect every year. I view these pieces of legislation to be very complementary.

● (1735)

I think it is important to also recognize that, because the government is in a fiscal position and it is in perpetual deficits, we cannot sustain a situation where the government is continually waiving the debts corporations owe it, whether through non-collection or errors in assessments in the first place. We have to do a better job of collecting the debts corporations owe the government so we can lower the tax burden on Canadians overall. This has to be a pillar of what we try to do here in this place, which is to provide income tax relief to hard-working Canadians. We can do that if we collect the money we are supposed to collect from corporations.

How big of a deal is this? Just last year, in the public accounts for the fiscal year of 2023-24, five corporations had over a billion dollars of their debts owing to the government written off. This is an astronomical sum, which has been increasing every year since about 2016-17. The rate these writeoffs are increasing is alarming.

Private Members' Business

Something is happening, and I believe greater transparency would help parliamentarians provide better laws and better tools to the CRA and the other departments that are supposed to collect debts from corporations, which we could do if we had greater information.

Frankly, the general public deserves to know why certain corporations are unable to pay their debts. Could we do a better job of assessing them in the first place? Could we understand whether there are frauds being perpetrated on the Canadian public or on the Canadian taxpayer? For example, it was widely reported last year that, within the CRA, there were fake tax returns and fake refunds that were processed to a number of fraudulent, likely connected, organized criminals, not just through COVID supports, the wage subsidies and the CERB, but through filing false income tax claims and false HST claims.

These frauds perpetrated on the CRA are frauds that are perpetrated on the taxpayer. These are frauds that are perpetrated on the Canadian people, and the Canadian people deserve to understand why this is happening, how much is being lost, and what we can do to prevent this in the future. As I say, the overall objective is to ensure we can lower the tax burden on all Canadians, and we can do that if we just collect the money we are supposed to collect from the corporations that owe it.

To give greater clarity to the bill, this bill does not go after the personal, private information of individual tax filers. This bill only impacts corporations and trusts. It is currently also geared towards partnerships, but I recognize that may bring some issues, which leads me to another point. I have worked diligently on this with many members from all parties in the House, including in the last Parliament, such as the NDP, the Bloc and the government party. I believe all parties have an opportunity to do something in the public interest here.

I am encouraged by the conversations I have had. I hope we may advance this to committee if there are some issues with the legislation or some constructive suggestions from my colleagues in either party or the government. I would welcome those suggestions in the spirit of making sure we can give taxpayers and the public more information about how their tax dollars are being used. I have faith in the great folks at the CRA that, if we were to implement this legislation, they would implement this registry along with the President of the Treasury Board and other officials with the same amount of vigour they have when using the existing tax law and applying the existing restrictions in section 241, which they claim prohibit them from releasing this information.

Private Members' Business

• (1740)

I believe that one of the reasons we are here today is that there has been a lack of will and a lack of oversight at the CRA to make sure that this situation is not getting worse, but the numbers could not paint a different picture. The amount of corporate writeoffs are increasing at alarming levels. As I mentioned, the top five corporations had over \$1 billion written off in one year. Just in 2024-25, 265 corporations alone had debts written off in excess of \$1 million. These are substantial amounts. If members think about what we argue about here every day about certain amounts of money going toward various social programs, this is money that, if collected, could be either given to Canadians in social supports or reduced from their tax bill.

It is incredibly important that we take this issue seriously. When I was the shadow critic for the Canada Revenue Agency in the last Parliament, I was underwhelmed by the seriousness with which previous ministers took this issue. When they decided to hide behind the privacy restrictions of section 241, I thought to myself that we should change the law. I was lucky enough to have drawn a high number in the lottery. I believe it is an honour to be able to present a bill in this place and to present one that has a chance of potentially becoming law.

I would not like to prejudge the rest of the debate here this evening, but I appreciate the opportunity to stand here tonight to make a good-faith effort to increase the transparency for taxpayers, to improve the laws of the country and to make sure we are doing what we can in this place to help people with affordability, because we will be able to use some of the money that is recovered to help people. Whether that will be through tax breaks or whether that will be through increased social supports, it is the real reason we are here. The government is in a perpetual state of deficit. This is my good-faith effort to help it climb out of the hole it has dug for itself. I am doing what I can to help the government balance the budget. That is what we should be here to do.

I would love to see this go through this evening. I would love to hear some feedback from my colleagues from other parties. I would also like to mention the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue, the hon. member for Joliette—Manawan and the hon. member for Mirabel. I have spoken with them about the importance of this issue, both at the finance committee and at other committees. As well, I have had positive and encouraging conversations with the minister, which I very much appreciate, about giving this a fair hearing here in this place tonight. I would just ask my hon. colleagues to keep an open mind.

I appreciate the opportunity, as I said. It is an honour to have the chance to make a change to the laws of this country. I want to thank everyone for this opportunity tonight.

• (1745)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is why I love Private Members' Business in the House: We see hon. members making good-faith attempts to contribute to our country in meaningful ways. This is a great legislative initiative that has been brought forward by the member for

Simcoe North. I very much appreciate him and his work at the finance committee in the past.

I know he mentioned in his remarks that there may be some issues with partnerships related to the Privacy Act. I know it was not his intention in this particular private member's bill to breach any of the Privacy Act protections for tax purposes or for individuals, but perhaps the member could suggest whether he is open to amendments in that area.

Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I spent a number of hours with my hon. colleague at the finance committee as he made sure that the previous government got its budget bills passed all the way through. It might have been a painful process, but the Liberals did get through it in the end.

I would say that I am open to reasonable suggestions. It was not my intention to create additional problems with respect to partnerships, because they are structured differently, of course. The primary thrust of this bill was to focus on corporations and trusts, with a strong emphasis on corporations. As I say, I would be open to suggestions regarding how to improve that portion of the bill if members think there is a better way to accomplish the objective.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Simcoe North for his leadership on this issue, which I think is grounded in one fundamental value: transparency. I would like to hear his comments on the consequences this measure could have in that regard, as well as the costs it could entail, both in terms of human resources and for the government. I would particularly like him to elaborate on the expected benefits.

What impact would this have on the treasury and how much does he estimate it would be?

[*English*]

Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my fellow colleague from the Bloc. He always has a very thoughtful question and intervention in this place.

As I mentioned in the speech, transparency is very important.

In terms of cost, I would just say that much of the work is already being done in these departments to understand what corporations owe what money. This bill would just require some of that information to be made public. Today, the people at CRA already know who owes what money. They already know what they write off because they have to publish the aggregate numbers in the public accounts every year. My estimate would be that this bill would not incur any additional costs to government. It would just require that some of the information it already holds be made public.

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am so pleased that this bill is coming to the floor of the House of Commons, and I thank the member for Simcoe North for bringing it forward.

Private Members' Business

He talked a bit in his speech about the urgent need for this bill because this addresses a problem that is getting worse. As recently as 2020, the CRA would at least, in an Order Paper question, give the dollar figure for the top writeoffs. Now it will not even do that, citing that it would allow people to guess or speculate which corporate entity, not individuals, may have had this large writeoff, when it is almost certainly a public company.

Does the member think that a public company that has its taxes written off by the government is entitled to its privacy and that this is not in the public interest? This is an urgent problem, and I would like him to add to his comments on its urgency.

Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Calgary Crowfoot for his diligent work on this file and for helping me in my quest to draft this legislation.

Absolutely, I do not believe that a corporation deserves any privacy when it owes the treasury or the CRA any money that is all of a sudden waived. There should be no expectation of privacy when that occurs, especially as those amounts have gotten higher and higher and higher.

This bill is focused on the writeoffs that are in excess of \$1 million. I am open to suggestions on other thresholds, but I do not believe, and I strongly agree with my colleague, that there should be any expectation of privacy when amounts of that size are written off.

● (1750)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-230, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

I want to thank the member for Simcoe North for putting this forth. I, too, share some of the core values that I think are expressed in the bill, one of which is a commitment to tax fairness. That is very important to me, as is a commitment to transparency and accountability. That is why our government put forward the national anti-fraud strategy recently, as well as committing to a financial crimes agency, among some other commitments we have made. Some of the legislative efforts and initiatives of our government demonstrate an intersection or an alignment of values.

The government is committed to being transparent and accountable in its operations. At its core, the bill aims to make government finances more open and accountable, particularly when large debts owed to the federal government are cancelled or forgiven.

One of the ways it proposes to do this is by creating a public registry showing major financial obligations owed to the government by corporations, trusts and partnerships that have been forgiven or settled without full repayment. However, the bill would require specific conditions to be met before a debt can be included in the registry, which is important.

First, a debt must be owed by a corporation, trust or partnership. This means that the registry would focus on significant financial obligations involving organizations. Second, the current iteration of

the legislation notes that the debt must be valued at \$1 million or more. Third, the debt must arise under an act of Parliament. Lastly, the debt must be waived, written off or forgiven in whole or in part.

I would note that the bill does not propose to change the criteria or authority under which debts may be forgiven. Those decisions would continue to be made under existing laws and policies.

In order to create this registry, the bill includes consequential amendments to several other acts, including the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act, the Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act, the Digital Services Tax Act and the Global Minimum Tax Act. However, these amendments would provide the CRA and other relevant bodies with the ability to share confidential taxpayer information with the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat for the purpose of populating the registry.

I would note that this may have important privacy implications, as I think the sponsor of the bill has noted. However, the bill attempts to strike a balance between transparency and privacy. It is my hope and my belief that striking a correct balance will be one item we will discuss when examining the bill in even greater detail, because it is indeed a delicate balance that needs to be carefully assessed.

While I believe that all members of the House support the high-level aims of the bill, I must raise a few concerns the government has with the proposed legislation.

One issue is that the bill does not distinguish between a writeoff of a debt or obligation and a waiver or forgiveness. If an online public registry were to be established, it would need to draw a clearer distinction between debts that are written off and those that may be waived or forgiven, just as they are presented in the public accounts. The types of debts to be included in the registry would therefore need to be clarified.

There are also potential privacy implications, as I have mentioned, with the legislation. The bill focuses on corporations, trusts and partnerships, and as a result, it does not identify individuals, which is a good thing. We support this. However, it is possible that in the case of partnerships, the name of an individual could be disclosed, in which case the Privacy Act could be engaged. The bill would therefore need to address these privacy concerns by explicitly prohibiting the disclosure of the names of any individuals.

● (1755)

On this side of the House, we believe that the proposed \$1-million threshold for reporting debts is also quite low. The government believes that this threshold would need to be increased in order to reduce the administrative burden of maintaining the registry.

Private Members' Business

It would also follow the same materiality principles already used in government financial policies to help reduce the risk of reputational harm. For example, publicizing smaller writeoffs could discourage businesses from engaging with government programs. That being said, a new proposed registry must leverage existing reporting mechanisms so as not to strain resources and to remain consistent with current documents and procedures.

The government believes that Bill C-230 is an important piece of legislation that could potentially strengthen financial reporting and transparency. I would like to again applaud the member for Simcoe North for advancing this legislation. One of the features of Private Members' Business is that it often advances priorities that have broad support in this House.

In conclusion, in that spirit, as with any proposed legislation, it is essential to carefully examine the bill. Those of us in this House must consider not only its intent but also its practical implications for government operations, stakeholder interests and Canadians at large.

Should the House vote in favour of this bill, I trust that we will do the work of scrutinizing it at the committee stage. I look forward to working on that with the member across the way, hopefully finding a way to get another private member's bill through the House of Commons. Again, I appreciate him for his good faith attempt to address an issue that he and many government members care about deeply.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, before I begin my speech, I just want to take a moment for some acknowledgements. I am fortunate to be supported by a parliamentary intern, Emily Gough. I thank her for being part of our team and for the conscientious approach she takes to her work, both for committees and for speeches. Many of the words I will read today are hers.

As the Bloc Québécois critic for public accounts, I want to highlight the initiative of my colleague from Simcoe North, his desire to hold the government to account and to be transparent. I appreciated his answer to the question I asked him about how much it would cost. He said that it would not incur any additional costs because, essentially, this data is already being collected. Why not make it public? That is an interesting point.

His bill aims to create a public registry, in the form of an online, searchable database, of information on any debt or obligation owed by, or any claim made against, a corporation, trust company or partnership. To avoid the public disclosure of all debts, obligations and claims, the bill also specifies that it would apply exclusively to debts, obligations or claims over \$1 million that have been waived, written off or forgiven, in whole or in part. The registry would specify the name of the corporation, trust company or partnership.

I also like the fact that our colleague included the concept of business names to prevent companies from hiding behind a number. I am sure that my colleague feels the same frustration I do when I look over public accounts and see some companies identified by a number only. This creates a certain degree of anonymity in contracts. I wish companies that win government contracts were al-

ways identified by their business names so it would be easier to find them in government documents. The registry would also specify the amount that was waived, written off or forgiven by the government, the period to which the amount relates and the act under which the debt, obligation or claim was owed or arose.

This information is important because Quebec and Canadian taxpayers are the ones financing the various companies to which the government grants loans. In 2024-25, the government wrote off \$7.3 billion, according to the 2025 public accounts. Of that amount, \$5 billion was written off by the Canada Revenue Agency. However, it is impossible to determine how the government deprived itself of such a large sum. Is it because of taxes not paid by individuals? Were they EI overpayments? In short, without any details, we can only speculate.

Fortunately, the work of journalists has helped us see things a little more clearly. According to an article in *The Globe and Mail*, the government wrote off or forgave more than \$18 billion in debt and other obligations in 2024, a \$13-billion increase over the previous year. That is more than the Quebec government's deficit. This followed another report by the same media outlet showing that 11 companies accounted for a quarter of the \$4.9 billion that had been announced before the year-end balance sheet. In 2023, \$1 billion of the \$5 billion in write-offs applied to just five cases.

Why does the government not disclose the names of the companies that benefited from these huge gifts? It seems to me that these sums should be repaid. The money could be used to fund housing, fund health transfers, and ensure that we do not run up a \$78-billion deficit. While my former colleague from Terrebonne, Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné, was fighting to help small and medium-sized businesses get more time, the government was offering huge gifts to large companies.

This lack of transparency is even more troubling when we look at what is happening on the ground, in regions such as the Gaspé Peninsula, where business owners have been struggling just to survive. While large companies quietly benefited from tax breaks worth billions of dollars, small businesses are struggling to repay modest emergency loans taken out during the pandemic. A business owner borrowed \$56,000 to develop local tourism, only to discover that, despite having been extended, the repayment deadlines were still impossible to meet for a highly seasonal business facing inflation and rising interest rates. All she was asking for was more time.

We have similar cases in my region of Abitibi-Témiscamingue. Community futures development corporations have told us that these cases are not unique. In our regions, very small businesses, even non-profit organizations, were unable to repay their loans on time. Meanwhile, big corporations like Chrysler have benefited from debt forgiveness in the past. This double standard is unacceptable. Small and medium-sized businesses should not be left behind while large corporations quietly benefit from decisions made behind closed doors.

Private Members' Business

• (1800)

That is exactly the reality that my colleague, Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné, who was rightfully elected in Terrebonne in 2021, pointed out to the government for more than two years. She consistently called for more flexible repayment terms for the Canada emergency business account, particularly for small and medium-sized businesses facing high inflation, economic uncertainty and the real threat of having to shut their doors. When Ottawa finally announced minor adjustments, it became clear that the measures fell far short of meeting the needs of Quebec's small businesses. Extending certain deadlines by a few days or months does nothing to help seasonal industries, tourism operators or family businesses that are already struggling due to rising interest rates.

At the same time, the Auditor General revealed major shortcomings in the management of the emergency programs, including the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars were entrusted to a multinational corporation without proper oversight. Once again, ordinary entrepreneurs are subject to strict repayment schedules, while the federal government is much more lenient toward these large corporations and outside contractors. This imbalance undermines public confidence and reinforces the need for greater transparency. This is in addition to the \$2.5 billion in foregone revenue from the 1% annual tax on vacant or underutilized housing that was introduced in January 2022 and repealed by the government in its latest budget.

The need for greater transparency becomes even more apparent when we recall the ordeal faced by Chrysler, one of the federal government's most significant and least explicable financial decisions in recent history. Nearly 10 years after the U.S., Canadian and Ontario governments bailed out Chrysler and General Motors during the financial crisis, Ottawa quietly wrote off \$2.6 billion in debt that Chrysler had never repaid. This decision appeared only as a line item in the Public Accounts of Canada, without any explanation, identification of the company concerned, or justification for the loss to taxpayers.

Subsequent reports revealed what the Auditor General had pointed out years earlier, that the federal government had not required a restructuring plan, had not monitored the use of funds, and had not ensured meaningful accountability. The initial \$1.25-billion loan to Chrysler accrued interest for nine years, only to be forgiven in its entirety. Meanwhile, the new entity, which is now profitable, has no obligation to repay Quebec and Canadian taxpayers. A similar loan granted to General Motors, worth over \$1 billion, also remains outstanding.

That is precisely why we agree in principle with the intent of this bill, while recognizing that its provisions deserve to be studied in greater detail in committee to ensure that it is implemented responsibly and effectively.

It is important to take action. Quebec taxpayers have to pay back their debts. The latest report from Employment and Social Development Canada showed that it had recovered \$2.7 billion of the \$3.2 billion in overpayments. However, when it comes to big corporations receiving billions of dollars, this government is clearly showing that not everyone is equal under the law.

What my colleague from Simcoe North is proposing is another tool for transparency. However, there are concerns about the protec-

tion of individuals, which clearly requires further study in committee. Still, as mentioned, the \$1-million threshold makes this bill worth studying. We agree in principle, but we want this bill to be carefully studied in committee.

• (1805)

G rard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honour to take part in this debate on Bill C-230, concerning transparency. First, here is a quick explanation of what the bill is all about. In Canada, and in other countries around the world, the government sometimes enters into agreements with businesses or individuals who owe money for unpaid taxes. Sometimes, agreements are reached.

The bill seeks to increase the transparency surrounding this mechanism, which allows large corporations that reach agreements with the government to have certain debts written off. The bill seeks to ensure that debts over \$1 million that are written off are publicly listed in a registry that would be available to all Canadians.

That is essentially what the bill we are debating today is all about. We just heard members from the government and the other opposition parties express interest in moving this bill forward and in reaching an agreement in principle to study what it is. Before getting to the heart of the matter, I would like to commend the bill's sponsor, the member for Simcoe North.

[English]

The member for Simcoe North was elected in 2021. I can assure the House that, in the last four years, he has made a very great impression on everybody who works with him. We have heard the other parties saying that he is a very strong man and parliamentarian. I am very proud to work with him. He is very bright, wise and hard-working, and we understand why; it is because he previously worked with the late hon. Jim Flaherty, the famous former finance minister in the Stephen Harper government.

• (1810)

[Translation]

Let us get back to the heart of the debate surrounding this bill. As I said earlier, agreements are sometimes reached between a government and companies that do not pay their debts, taxes and duties. Agreements may be reached to set all that aside and write off the debt.

Private Members' Business

There is a difference between someone who has a minor problem and is a little behind on their payments, and debts totalling billions of dollars. As *The Globe and Mail* reported in recent months, the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA, wrote off \$18 billion last year. That is terrible, when we think about it. The CRA is literally hunting down small and medium-sized businesses in order to get every last cent that is owed to the government. If, God forbid, hard-working Canadians with modest incomes are \$200 or \$300 short on their tax return, the CRA is quick to come down on them and make them pay. Interest begins to accrue on day one, even though sometimes the information they get from the CRA is incorrect. I will discuss that later.

We learned that large companies got out of paying a full \$18 billion, even though they were supposed to. A debt of \$4.7 billion was written off. The government waived \$10.9 billion and companies were exempted from paying \$2.6 billion. We are talking about a total of \$18 billion. We could do a lot with that money, but the government is simply waving it off. Companies owe this money, but they are not paying it back.

That is why the bill aims for transparency, so that Canadians can know which companies have reached an agreement with the government to avoid paying a debt of more than \$1 million. We are not targeting small businesses or citizens who owe \$200 in taxes, but rather those who owe more than \$1 million in taxes, who have not paid and who have made an agreement with the government not to pay. I believe that Canadian taxpayers have a right to know so that they can then judge the government's decisions.

In a democracy, the more transparency the better for society. However, we understand that agreements protecting confidentiality and information are a fact of life. Let us be clear: The purpose of the bill is not to disclose corporate secrets. Rather, it seeks to determine how companies are managed to understand why taxes that should have been paid were not. That is why we need to see what kind of agreement we can reach in this regard, and that is the purpose of this bill. It is a very good thing.

A responsible government is not afraid to go public about decisions that affect businesses. Transparency makes it easier for people to engage in healthy and honest debate when it comes to judging government decisions. Canadians deserve to know why companies are not paying all of their taxes. They have to pay, just like everyone else. It is an obligation. Why, then, are large write-offs not disclosed? I must admit that, when I first began studying this bill, I was quite surprised to learn that so much of the money that should have been paid had in fact not been collected. Last year it was \$18 billion.

I am the national revenue critic for the official opposition. I took over the role following my colleague from Simcoe North. As members can see, I was in good hands. However, I still have a lot to learn before I can be as relevant and effective as my colleague from Simcoe North. That said, it is quite clear that the Canada Revenue Agency really needs to improve its image, and that is to say the least. There is nothing more important for a taxpayer than to ensure that they pay the exact amount of taxes owed to the government.

However, the Auditor General's report, released just over a month ago, gave a very scathing review of the current situation at

the Canada Revenue Agency. More specifically, it reveals that telephone wait times are approximately twice as long as expected. When someone does manage to reach an agent who is supposed to provide accurate and relevant information, the Auditor General's report on the CRA says that the information provided is incorrect 83% of the time.

Imagine a worker who cannot afford an accountant and has to fill out his tax return on his own. He is told that everything is fine, that he has to complete line *x* by writing in amount *y*, and that it will be correct. However, four times out of five, the information he is given is incorrect. Then, unfortunately, a few weeks later he receives a notice from the CRA demanding full payment of the \$200 or so he owes because of a delay, because he did not fill out his return correctly. Now the interest is accruing rapidly, but the information he was given was incorrect. The whole story is pretty astounding. It is quite shocking to learn that \$18 billion has not been collected as it should have been from businesses and individuals.

That is why this bill seeks to make information available and ensure that everything is done properly. We have heard some highly relevant comments from our colleagues about protecting confidential information and data. I want to assure everyone in the House that the purpose of this bill is not to expose these companies, much less reveal their corporate secrets. If by chance these companies have entered agreements that allow them to avoid paying \$2 million, \$3 million or \$4 million in taxes owed, then it seems only fitting that Canadian workers should be informed.

Obviously, our party supports the steps taken by our colleague from Simcoe North. We have observed that both the government and the opposition parties agree in principle, while pointing out the fact that we will have to work effectively in committee. That is the beauty of democracy. Those who watch and listen to question period already know that our debates can be quite harsh at times. That goes without saying. On the other hand, when we can find common ground with all the parties in the interest of ministerial transparency, to give Canadians more information, then Canadians are the first to benefit.

• (1815)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will pick up where the member ended off, because I think there is a great deal of merit to that.

What most Canadians witness when they tune into Parliament, for those who do tune into it where it is televised, is often question period. However, what we see in question period is not necessarily reflective of what is outside of it. We see a lot of co-operation. Based on what I have heard, both from the introducer, the member for Simcoe North, and from the parliamentary secretary, I get the sense that maybe they had a great deal of discussion about the issue of taxes and the Canada Revenue Agency. At least that is the sense I am getting.

If we look at the process, it tells me that at times, it can work to the advantage of all Canadians when positive things take place in our standing committees. The best I can tell, the member, who plays an important role in opposition, has gone to a committee and found through the committee experience an area where we are somewhat vulnerable, at the end of the day bringing forward legislation that would provide more transparency and accountability. It seems to be very reasonable.

I listened to the parliamentary secretary's comments, and on behalf of the government, he expressed some genuine concerns the government has. This bill will, in all likelihood, go to committee, and I hope that members on all sides of the House will look at ways we might be able to improve it.

A couple of things have happened. One is that a member has brought forward a private member's bill based on issues that have surfaced here in Parliament. By raising this issue and bringing it forward in a private member's bill, which is programmed, I must say, it will ultimately be able to pass through the system, in essence because he was low in the numbers. He has taken advantage of that, as I or any other member would, to try to make a real difference.

It is encouraging to see this type of legislation come forward. I hope to see it go to committee and to see some amendments made to it, because it sounds like there will be a need for amendments. My colleague made reference, for example, to the \$1 million figure. That seems potentially reasonable. We will hear more about it when we go to committee.

There is a great deal of concern about privacy. When I was talking with the parliamentary secretary, I asked him if he had a question on that, because I had a question I was interested in related to the partnership issue and its impact on privacy. Does the member have any concerns in regard to privacy protection?

I also have thoughts on the release of information. Could that be, in certain situations, to the detriment of workers potentially and the community as a whole? For example, there might be something of national security at a particular company. It could be something that might ultimately prevent a company from going in a certain direction, which could cause more harm. I think seeing potential concerns addressed at the committee level, because there is only going to be two hours of debate at most on this issue, has a great deal of value.

The member started off talking about the CRA, which was referenced earlier today with respect to the budget legislation. In the question I posed, I highlighted the important work the CRA does. I know that a lot of criticism is levelled at the CRA, and understandably so, especially in certain situations, but as a collection agency,

Private Members' Business

if I can put it that way, working on behalf of the government, I believe it is one of the very best in the world in terms of the service it provides for all of us. When I say "all of us", I am not talking about parliamentarians; I am talking about Canadians as a whole.

● (1820)

We go through some very difficult times, whether as corporations, as partnerships or as individuals. A few years ago, we were hearing a great deal about individuals having issues with CERB payments, with the wage loss program, for example, where there was no doubt abuse that had taken place. Sometimes it was intentional, and sometimes it was not. When it was not intentional, was there going to be any grace given?

When I had an opportunity to talk to the CRA on behalf of my constituents, what I found was that CRA does have a great deal of discretion, and not only for corporations, although someone pointed out that, I think he said, five corporations had \$1 billion in debt written off. That is a heck of a lot of money for five corporations or businesses, if I am quoting the person correctly.

There does need to be accountability and transparency in situations, but we also recognize that there are extenuating circumstances at times that might actually justify not sharing information. A good example of that is the private individual. There are individuals who do abuse and who do break laws within our taxation system. There are privacy laws in place in order to protect. I would suggest that the same principle applies universally with all individuals or all the different sectors that go through the Canada Revenue Agency, but for a vast majority, that is not an issue.

I am very sensitive to the issue in terms of how we can protect the integrity of the system while at the same time provide additional transparency and accountability.

I have spoken previously on this issue in regard to investment when it comes to dealing with tax avoidance and evasion. Over the last number of years under the Trudeau government, substantial monies, into the hundreds of millions of dollars, have gone into looking at ways in which we can recuperate even more money in those two areas. Whether it is initiatives like budgetary initiatives to try to deal with the issue of tax fairness, or legislation like this, it is about tax fairness, accountability and transparency.

We need tax dollars. All governments need tax dollars. Canadians do not mind paying taxes if in fact they believe they are being treated fairly and if, at the end of the day, there is a benefit.

This is something all of us have a responsibility to move towards, because we want to keep the high level of respect for the CRA. If there are things we can do to increase transparency and accountability, I think that is a positive.

Adjournment Proceedings

● (1825)

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am glad to be able to speak to this bill. I feel quite strongly about the issues within it. This came to my attention a few years ago as a problem when, in an Order Paper question, which, unlike a question during question period, is something the government is required to answer. The government is not allowed to just tap dance around and refuse to answer an Order Paper question. To refuse would actually be a contempt of Parliament, so Order Paper questions are a good way to try to force real answers from the government.

In response to a question about the nature of tax losses, writeoffs by the CRA from large corporate filers that have had their tax obligations to the Crown, to the people of Canada, written off, the information we received back was very minimal. If I recall correctly, we did get the dollar figures for the larger writeoffs that had occurred. It actually generated some speculation in the media about who these corporate entities might have been, but they were not named. At least we had an idea of the scale of the large writeoffs that had occurred at the Canada Revenue Agency.

In subsequent years, though, the CRA has taken an even less transparent approach to these questions and outright refused to answer them, citing privacy. We are not talking about individuals; we are talking about corporate filings. The CRA is citing privacy, meaning that the concern is that it would be possible to guess the identity of these corporate filers having their taxes written off.

This bill is a great step forward in clarifying and giving legal direction to ensure the publication of this important information. However, I would like to stress that this is a pretty small step in the problem of ever-increasing writeoffs. Why is the agency failing to collect taxes? What is going on that is triggering these writeoffs? If we knew who it was, we would be able to identify maybe whether it was a matter of bankruptcy, and we would be able to know whether there was maybe public money that is tied up as well, or whether there were subsidies paid to the business. We would have a better idea of the whole overall problem if we had that information.

It is part of a pattern of ever-decreasing transparency from the government. This is a trend that is getting worse. It is actually very unfortunate that we are having to resort to legislation for something that the CRA really ought to be doing on its own and consciously chose to stop, or even that it is reducing the amount of information it gives to Canadians.

I know in Private Members' Business we cannot debate back and forth, but earlier tonight we heard praise for the CRA and the wonderful work it does. No doubt there are thousands of good, solid and hard-working people at the CRA, but we have an army in this country of 59,000 tax collectors, and they are writing off these enormous amounts. They fail to collect from offshore filers and give special breaks to offshore filers. They do not answer the phone, and they do not give correct information when they do get to the phone. There are some really serious problems at this agency, and this bill is just one small piece, which I support vigorously to try to improve the CRA.

● (1830)

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

HEALTH

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals spent more than \$54 million on the vaccine injury support program. Global News reported that over \$36 million of that money went to one consulting firm, Oxaro. However, out of the 3,300 claims from Canadians, more than 1,700 were still waiting for answers.

Now that the government has cancelled Oxaro's contract, after admitting the program failed, how much money has the government recovered from Oxaro?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, let me be clear. The allegations regarding Oxaro's management of the vaccine injury support program are unacceptable. This program was created to support vulnerable Canadians, and it is evident that it has not operated in the way that Canadians deserve.

This is why, from the moment our new government became aware of these issues, we acted decisively. The Minister of Health directed that every option be considered. She instructed the Public Health Agency of Canada to expedite its audit of both the program and its third party administrator. That audit is under way, and we will make its findings public as soon as they are available. We need to see the full results of that audit.

Our commitment is unwavering. We will take whatever action is required to ensure vulnerable Canadians receive the support they need and that all Canadians can trust that their tax dollars are being managed responsibly. If the audit recommends stopping payments to the current administrator, we will do that. If the audit recommends recovering funds or taking further action, we will do that as well. As the minister has said repeatedly, nothing is off the table.

Adjournment Proceedings

We also know that the previous government, while well-intentioned, stood up this program in haste. It did not review how similar programs operate in other jurisdictions, including right here in Canada. When the Minister of Health recognized this gap, she directed officials to redesign the program using best practices. We learned that Quebec, along with every G7 country, administers this type of program internally, not through a third party.

That is exactly what we are doing. As announced in August, beginning April 1, the Government of Canada will assume full responsibility for delivering the vaccine injury support program. Operational details are still being finalized, and we will share them openly as soon as they are available and ready. What matters most is that we are fixing what was broken. We are restoring accountability, and we are ensuring that Canadians who need this program can trust it.

Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, here we go again with some more of the Prime Minister's speaking points.

I really do not understand the parliamentary secretary's approach to this answer. It was a very simple question. Meanwhile, there are 1,700 people out there with serious injuries, and the government has decided not to answer anything.

I will ask the question again. How much money has the government recovered from Oxaro for their mismanagement of the vaccine injury support program, just the number?

Maggie Chi: Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize that everyone recognizes the problem with the vaccine injury support program.

Our new government acted immediately to fix these problems. We are bringing management of the vaccine injury support program back to the government and have instructed the Public Health Agency of Canada to expedite its audit of the program and the company delivering it.

Despite what the member has said, I already answered the question. The audit is ongoing, and as soon as it is completed, we will make those results available. We will keep all options on the table moving forward, so that vulnerable Canadians, and all Canadians, can have faith that we will be there for Canadians when they need the help and that we are spending tax dollars in a way that is transparent and accountable.

EMPLOYMENT

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, tonight I am following up on a question I raised previously about the ongoing youth unemployment crisis in this country. Youth unemployment is persistently high, still well over 14%, more than a full percentage point higher than it was a year ago. Over 440,000 young Canadians between 15 and 25 are currently unemployed.

In this context, Conservatives put forward our Conservative youth jobs plan, calling on the government to unleash the economy, fix immigration, fix training and build homes where the jobs are, and we identified some very specific proposals for achieving that result. Unfortunately, with this budget, we are not seeing progress; we are seeing the government move backward.

I want to highlight tonight, in particular, some significant new problems created by this budget in the area of training.

We called on the government to fix training by offering relatively more support to students seeking in-demand skills. That is, if students are pursuing studies in a field where there is a desperate need in the labour market for people to do those kinds of jobs, we think it is reasonable for government-funded grants to magnify the market signal to help students see and understand that there will likely be more economic opportunities if they pursue studies in that field.

Liberals decided, effectively, to go in the opposite direction, because in the budget on page 217, the government proposed to eliminate student grants for students going to private institutions. In the post-secondary system, we have public, we have private not-for-profit and we have private for-profit, but the issue is that there are many vocational programs that are simply not available in public institutions.

For certain kinds of programs, someone who is interested in a particular career will, as a student, opt to go to a private institution, and there is obviously nothing wrong with that. These are good careers that are needed, and this reflects demand in the labour market. Telling students who are trying to access skills and in-demand professions that they can no longer access student grants because of the institution they are going to, but continuing to offer those same grants at the same level to students at universities, is not fair.

It does not seem reasonable to say this to a young person studying traditional Chinese medicine, to be a chiropractor, to work in the beauty industry or to work in other industries where the formation is generally not offered at universities. To say their field is not worthy of student grants, but that somebody who studies philosophy, public policy, as I did, or some other program at a university should have access to a full grant, seems to me like profession prejudice, like discrimination against students who are opting for careers that do not involve a university education.

We need to be honouring, dignifying and appreciating the careers that people work hard in, regardless of whether they involve studies at a university. However, the government is proposing a differential, discriminatory system with respect to training, which is that if someone studies in those critical, in-demand professions where the formation is only available at private institutions, they lose access to student grants, but if they are studying any kind of university program, regardless of how relevant it is to the labour market, they do get those grants.

Conservatives think this is unfair. We think this budget moves in the opposite direction and introduces more discrimination and unfairness in the training system. What is the government's response to why it put that discriminatory provision in the budget?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1835)

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for raising this important issue. We share his concerns for Canadians, especially young Canadians who are looking for good jobs and a strong future.

Our government is making generational investments with youth at the forefront. We know that a strong economy starts with a strong workforce, and that means creating opportunities for young people to gain skills, experience and confidence. Budget 2025 delivers on this commitment. We are investing \$1.5 billion over three years in youth programs, the largest youth employment investment in a generation.

Through the youth employment and skills strategy, we will provide wraparound support for 20,000 youth in 2026, helping them overcome barriers and succeed in the labour market. We are also expanding programs that work. The Canada summer jobs program will create 100,000 work opportunities in summer 2026. In my colleague's riding alone in 2025, the number of organizations that benefited from this program was 42, and it created 159 jobs for the youth in his riding.

The student work placement program will deliver 55,000 placements for students in 2026-27, connecting education to real-world experience. Through the new youth climate corps, we are investing \$40 million over two years to train young Canadians for climate emergency response and community resilience.

These measures reflect what youth told us during budget consultations: Their top priorities are lowering the cost of living, housing, and access to mental health supports. We are listening and acting, and the results speak for themselves. Youth employment rose by 21,000 jobs in October, the first increase since January. Youth unemployment dropped by almost 1%. Programs like Canada summer jobs deliver lasting impact, and 88% of that program's participants are employed within two years of completion. The student work placement program benefits employers too; 97% say it strengthens their business. Youth in the employment and skills strategy see real gains; 76% are employed one year after the program, with earnings up by almost \$9,500.

These investments are not just numbers; they are opportunities. They mean more young Canadians are building careers, contributing to their communities and driving our economy forward. At the same time, we are tackling the skilled trades shortage head-on. Budget 2025 invests \$75 million over three years to expand union-based apprenticeship training, as well as nearly \$1 billion annually to make trades training more affordable and accessible.

Because I had prepared my remarks before my hon. colleague's question this morning, which is a little different than the one I thought he would come back to, I want to reassure him that students who are currently enrolled in and benefiting from the student grants for non-university or university educational institutions that do not qualify, if they are already enrolled and they continue in that vein with their studies until they graduate, the program remains the same.

Whether it is building homes, responding to climate challenges or powering innovation, young Canadians will lead the way, and our government will be there investing in their success and building one Canadian economy that works for everyone.

• (1840)

Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, my colleague spent a lot of time talking about the Canada summer jobs program. As she knows, this is not a new program. It has in fact existed in this country since I was a very small child, which was a long time ago. However, what is new with the program is that the Liberals have established a very short duration for the jobs; the average is eight weeks, so effectively there are not summer jobs but summer half-jobs for many students, which is not what young people need and not what employers want. The Liberals are shortening the duration in order to suggest that they have created more jobs than they would have if they were normal-length summer jobs.

I want to come back to the issue around training and the discriminatory measures introduced in the budget. The parliamentary secretary said that this will not affect any current students, but what about future students? What about the high school student who says, "I would love to be a chiropractor", "I would love to explore the field of acupuncture" or "I would love to work in a salon, but my family struggles financially, and I will no longer get student grants in these programs." How is that fair?

Annie Koutrakis: Madam Speaker, the member opposite says he cares about youth employment, but when it mattered, he and his party voted against a budget that delivers real opportunities for young Canadians.

Budget 2025 invests \$1.5 billion over three years in youth programs; creates 100,000 Canada summer jobs, which is 24,000 more than last year; funds 55,000 student work placements; and launches a youth climate corps to prepare youth for the jobs of tomorrow. These investments are working. Youth employment rose by 21,000 jobs in October, the first increase since January, and youth unemployment dropped by almost 1%. The Canada summer jobs program, even though the member thinks it is not important, sees 88% of participants employed within two years, and the student work placement program benefits 97% of employers.

We are building opportunities for youth. The member opposite continues to vote against them. We will always be there for the youth.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The motion that the House do now adjourn is 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 6:45 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 27, 2025

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Petitions

Falun Gong

Falk (Provencher) 4237

Medical Assistance in Dying

Falk (Provencher) 4237

Falun Gong

Epp 4237

Air Service to India

Lamoureux 4237

Youth Employment

Genuis 4237

Ukraine

Genuis 4238

Medical Assistance in Dying

Genuis 4238

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Genuis 4238

Wildfire Response

Johns 4238

Questions on the Order Paper

Lamoureux 4238

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1

Bill C-15. Second reading 4239

Bailey 4239

Lamoureux 4240

Brunelle-Duceppe 4240

Johns 4241

Ho 4241

Lamoureux 4243

Brunelle-Duceppe 4243

Doherty 4243

Gill (Windsor West) 4244

Leitão 4245

Brunelle-Duceppe 4246

Johns 4246

Davies (Niagara South) 4246

Lamoureux 4248

Champoux 4248

Bonk 4248

Kwan 4248

Lamoureux 4250

Gaudreau 4250

Epp 4251

Barlow 4251

Lamoureux 4252

Brunelle-Duceppe 4253

Doherty 4253

Leitão 4253

Viersen 4254

Gaudreau 4255

Ntumba 4255

Falk (Provencher) 4255

Bardeesy 4257

Brunelle-Duceppe 4257

Gallant 4258

Bardeesy 4258

Doherty 4259

Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan) 4260

Coteau 4260

Barrett 4260

Gerretsen 4261

Falk (Provencher) 4261

Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan) 4262

Stevenson 4262

Lamoureux 4263

Brunelle-Duceppe 4264

Gladu 4264

Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley) 4264

Lamoureux 4265

Champoux 4266

Albas 4266

Gazan 4266

Battiste 4266

Doherty 4268

Champoux 4268

Leitão 4268

Gallant 4268

Albas 4269

Lamoureux 4270

Brunelle-Duceppe 4270

Gladu 4270

May 4271

Gerretsen 4272

Deltell 4272

Champoux 4273

Richards 4273

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

White Rock Youth Ambassadors

Klassen 4274

Wildfires in Newfoundland and Labrador

Rowe 4274

Ian Ross	
Lavack	4274
Veterans Affairs	
Dalton	4274
Normand Lapointe	
Lavoie	4275
Faith Communities in Kildonan—St. Paul	
Dancho	4275
Men's Health	
Fry	4275
Canada-Italy Interparliamentary Group	
Roberts	4275
Breast Implant Registry	
Thériault	4275
Quebec's Health Care System	
Housefather	4276
Opioids	
Au	4276
Colleen Jones	
Duguid	4276
The Economy	
DeRidder	4276
Rolande Faucher	
Fortier	4276
Prime Minister of Canada	
Ma	4277
Colleen Jones	
Miedema	4277

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources	
Poilievre	4277
MacKinnon	4277
Poilievre	4277
Dabrusin	4277
Poilievre	4277
MacKinnon	4278
Poilievre	4278
MacKinnon	4278
Poilievre	4278
Dabrusin	4278
Poilievre	4278
MacKinnon	4278
Intergovernmental Affairs	
Blanchet	4278
MacKinnon	4278
Blanchet	4279
Dabrusin	4279
Blanchet	4279

MacKinnon	4279
Ethics	
Paul-Hus	4279
The Speaker	4279
Paul-Hus	4279
MacKinnon	4279
International Trade	
Gill (Windsor West)	4279
Zerucelli	4279
Gill (Windsor West)	4280
Zerucelli	4280
Gourde	4280
Lightbound	4280
Gourde	4280
Lightbound	4280
Motz	4280
Hajdu	4280
The Environment	
Bonin	4280
Dabrusin	4281
Bonin	4281
Dabrusin	4281
International Trade	
Lefebvre	4281
Guay	4281
Baber	4281
Hajdu	4281
Ho	4281
Zerucelli	4281
Strauss	4282
Sidhu (Brampton East)	4282
Allison	4282
Long	4282
Indigenous Affairs	
Harrison	4282
Alty	4282
Natural Resources	
Scheer	4282
MacKinnon	4282
Scheer	4283
MacKinnon	4283
Calkins	4283
MacKinnon	4283
Calkins	4283
MacKinnon	4283
Jansen	4283
Zerucelli	4283
Jansen	4283
MacKinnon	4284
Dalton	4284
MacKinnon	4284
Viersen	4284
MacKinnon	4284
Richards	4284

Fraser	4284
Steel and Aluminum Industry	
Danko	4284
Hajdu	4285
Indigenous Affairs	
Schmale	4285
Alty	4285
Au	4285
Alty	4285
Kibble	4285
Alty	4286
Public Safety	
Maloney	4286
Fraser	4286
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Rempel Garner	4286
Sahota	4286
Natural Resources	
Johns	4286
Dabrusin	4286
Kwan	4286
MacKinnon	4286
Business of the House	
Scheer	4287
MacKinnon	4287

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Second reading	4287
Richards	4287
Lamoureux	4288
DeBellefeuille	4288
Caputo	4288
Larouche	4289
Lamoureux	4290
Berthold	4291
DeBellefeuille	4291
Gazan	4291
Lamoureux	4292
Viersen	4293
Blanchette-Joncas	4293
Cody	4293
Lamoureux	4295
Larouche	4295

Kirkland	4295
Johns	4296
Danko	4297
Doherty	4298
Blanchette-Joncas	4298
DeRidder	4298
Lamoureux	4300
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	4300
Lemire	4300
Johns	4300
DeBellefeuille	4301
O'Rourke	4302
Gill (Windsor West)	4302
Larouche	4302
Dowdall	4303
Lamoureux	4304
Brassard	4305
Blanchette-Joncas	4305
Chenette	4305
Arnold	4306
Larouche	4307
Sari	4307
Brassard	4307

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Financial Administration Act	
Chambers	4308
Bill C-230. Second reading	4308
Turnbull	4310
Lemire	4310
Kelly	4310
Turnbull	4311
Lemire	4312
Deltell	4313
Lamoureux	4314
Kelly	4316

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Health	
Mazier	4316
Chi	4316
Employment	
Genuis	4317
Koutrakis	4318

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>