



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 065
Tuesday, December 2, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 2, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prière

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development regarding the supplementary estimates (B), 2025-26.

The committee has considered votes 1b and 10b under Department of the Environment and vote 1b under Parks Canada Agency and reports the same.

[*English*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, regarding the membership of committees of the House.

If the House gives its consent, I move that the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

* * *

AUTO INDUSTRY

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions amongst the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That a take-note debate on Canada's auto industry be held on Wednesday, December 3, 2025, pursuant to Standing Order 53.1, and that, notwithstanding any

standing order or usual practice of the House: (a) members rising to speak during the debate may indicate to the Chair that they will be dividing their time with another member; (b) the time provided for the debate be extended beyond four hours, as needed, to include a minimum of 12 periods of 20 minutes each; and (c) no quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent shall be received by the Chair.

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

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

RIGHT TO DEFEND

Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand and present petition e-6777, created by Ms. Outwater, a resident in my neighbouring riding of Peterborough.

All 1,767 of these signatories are concerned about the current system the Liberal government has created when it comes to how safe they feel on the streets of their community. People are concerned that there are repeat offenders continuing to get out on bail so quickly and continuing to reoffend.

They would like something done about the fact that, oftentimes, when there is an intruder, the homeowner will defend themselves and then end up being charged. The petitioners would like to see some changes to that in our justice system. Therefore, I present this petition.

• (1005)

FIREARMS

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition to the House that firearms owners from across Canada have brought forward. They are concerned about past legislation and new orders in council that target law-abiding firearms owners.

The petitioners say that Bill C-21 does nothing to tackle firearms violence, but rather adds red tape to law-abiding Canadians. They also describe how the bill does little to tackle the true source of violence, which is gangs and organized crime.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners are calling on the government to repeal Bill C-21 and devote greater resources to policing so that they can combat the sources of violence.

SAFE CONSUMPTION SITE

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of angry parents with children at Abbotsford Traditional School, who are concerned about BC Housing's policy to establish a "safe" consumption site across from the school track.

Parents want to protect the innocence of their children. Hard drugs have no business being close to high schools, and parents are demanding that all funding to BC Housing from the federal government be eliminated until it comes to its senses and respects the innocence of children.

FALUN GONG

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of petitioners who are concerned about the persecution of the Falun Gong in China. Specifically, they are calling upon the Government of Canada to proactively deploy all possible avenues to publicly call on the Chinese regime to end its persecution of the Falun Gong in China and end transnational repression abroad; to continue to impose sanctions on and pursue accountability against Chinese Communist Party officials and proxies responsible for those human rights violations; and, finally, to take stronger measures to protect the Falun Gong community targeted by foreign repression.

SMALL CRAFT HARBOURS

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise with a petition from Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are deeply worried about the condition of Canada's small craft harbours throughout the province. This is vital infrastructure for our fish harvesters and coastal communities.

The petitioners point out that most harbours rely on volunteers, and that only about 700 of the 950 harbours across the country can be properly supported. Despite government promises to bring these harbours up to standard, the program is still operating on the same \$90-million budget, with little visible progress. The petitioners note that stalled maintenance, aging infrastructure and limited federal investments are holding back jobs and growth, and that communication with our harbour authorities simply has not kept pace with community needs.

They are calling on the government to double small craft harbour funding, strengthen engagement with coastal communities, make permanent investments in modern infrastructure and, finally, deliver on its own 2024 harbour commitments. I am honoured to table this petition on their behalf.

[*Translation*]

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning, I would like to present petition e-6768, which has been signed by over 4,000 people.

The petitioners are calling on the government to ensure proper labelling of food made from gene-edited plants and genetically

modified foods. That is important. The petition also talks about genetically engineered livestock and makes the same requests in that regard.

I will read the petition:

Whereas:

Genetically engineered foods, also referred to as genetically modified foods or genetically modified organisms (GMOs), are not required to be labelled in Canada and companies are not voluntarily labelling their genetically engineered food and food ingredients;

New genetic engineering techniques of gene editing, such as CRISPR, are projected to lead to the development of many new genetically engineered foods, including genetically engineered fruits and vegetables as well as genetically engineered livestock;

Many foods from gene-edited plants will not be assessed for safety by Health Canada and will not appear on Health Canada's list of approved novel foods;

Many Canadians want access to information about how their food is produced and public opinion polls have consistently found that over 75% of Canadians want mandatory labelling of genetically engineered foods;

Mandatory labelling will simplify the tracking of GMOs in supply chains for food businesses;

Mandatory labelling will provide transparency to improve public trust in Canada's food system; and

The federal government has stated its commitment to the principle of transparency.

We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of Canada, call upon the House of Commons to establish mandatory labelling of all genetically engineered foods sold in Canada.

That is what these people are calling for. I think that we need to comply with their request for transparency. I thank them for preparing this petition, which I am pleased to present this morning.

● (1010)

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present petition e-6903, which has been signed by 2,275 people.

[*English*]

The petitioners are asking for faster processing times for humanitarian and compassionate applications. They want to see a transparent action plan to address the backlog and ensure reasonable decision timelines and they are asking the Minister of Immigration and the House to consider that.

TAXATION

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this petition is, in essence, a reflection on Bill C-4.

The petitioners are calling on the government to provide tax cuts to Canadians.

I would suggest that we have things such as Bill C-4, which has tax breaks for the middle class and 22 million Canadians and a tax break for first-time homebuyers, and gets rid of the consumer carbon tax.

* * *

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 ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

* * *

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

CLOSURE OF ALGOMA STEEL PLANT

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that I have received notice of a request for an emergency debate.

I invite the hon. Leader of the Opposition to rise and make a brief intervention.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, steelworkers are the backbone of our nation, and the products they make are the bones of our economy. We cannot have a modern economy without steel, and Canada's steel sector has been under attack from American tariffs and the Canadian government's taxes.

Steelworkers go to work every day, work in difficult conditions and bring home a paycheque for their families to raise their kids in the hopes that their children will have the same opportunity that they had. The member for Edmonton Griesbach could tell us all about that. His father worked at the Algoma plant in Sault Ste. Marie for 30 years, so for him, it was personal when he learned that one-third of those incredible workers would be losing their jobs.

A thousand families sat around dinner tables last night, wondering how they would pay their mortgages. Fathers had conversations with their children, saying they will not be able to register for soccer or hockey for the next season. Mothers and fathers tossed and turned in their beds, wondering what their future looked like and whether they would have to move.

This is after the Prime Minister looked them in the eyes and promised that he would protect their jobs. He said he would negotiate a win with President Trump to end the tariffs and there would be a deal by July 21. That was last summer. He missed his self-imposed deadline. He said he would be “elbows up”, and now he says, “Who cares?”

Those families care. I want them to know that we Conservatives care about them. We want to fight for their jobs every day and in every way.

We want to know, in an emergency debate, why the Prime Minister gave \$400 million in tax dollars, money that came from hard-

Speaker's Ruling

working people who are struggling to pay for their groceries and their mortgages, without getting job guarantees. It rips off both taxpayers and workers. It is another bait and switch by the Prime Minister.

On behalf of all those families, we want the answers to those questions. We want an end to the Prime Minister's Liberal industrial carbon tax on steel production, which makes it even more difficult for Canadian steelmakers to compete with their American counterparts. Trump's tariffs plus the Liberal taxes are driving jobs south of this country. That is why we, as Conservatives, are fighting back.

We want to get a fair deal, without tariffs, with the Americans. We want an end to the industrial carbon tax. We want to make sure that \$400 million results in job guarantees, because that is what taxpayers paid for. However, to get any of that, we need a debate on the floor of the House of Commons to put forward the positive ideas, protect paycheques and make sure that the vital industry of steel is strong here in this country.

That is what we are fighting for. It is for the Canadian people who work hard to be able to have good jobs and buy food and affordable homes in safe neighbourhoods and a nation that puts Canada first.

● (1015)

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his intervention. However, I am not satisfied that this request meets the requirements of the Standing Orders at this time.

That being said, I know this is a topic of great interest to many members. I want to assure the House that I am open to reconsidering the request at a later date if the situation warrants it.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ADMISSIBILITY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-12—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on November 28, 2025, by the deputy leader of the government in the House of Commons regarding amendments adopted by the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security during clause-by-clause consideration 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. The committee's report was presented to the House earlier the same day.

Speaker's Ruling

In raising the point of order, the deputy House leader of the government asked the Speaker to review the content of the report, arguing that nine of the amendments included therein were inadmissible on the grounds that they violated the parent act rule and should not have been considered by the committee.

[Translation]

The amendments in question propose changes to the Oceans Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. They include one amendment adding new clause 24.1 (CPC-2), six amendments adding new clauses 39.1 to 39.4 (CPC-8, CPC-13, CPC-14, CPC-15, CPC-16 and CPC-17) and two amendments adding clauses 75.1 and 75.2 (CPC-30 and CPC-33).

All nine amendments had been ruled inadmissible by the Chair of the committee, since they seek to amend sections of either the Oceans Act or the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act that are not amended by Bill C-12.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 771:

...an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent Act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill.

The committee chair's rulings on these amendments were challenged and overturned. The committee then debated the amendments and adopted them.

The member for Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, in his intervention on the matter, argued that each amendment relates directly to Bill C-12's objectives, which he described as including strengthening public safety, reinforcing the integrity of the immigration system and improving its efficiency, transparency and accountability. He contended that the amendments are admissible on that basis and that the committee was acting within its authority when it decided to adopt them.

In his remarks, the member for Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière noted a decision by Speaker Regan that sets out key considerations related to the Parent Act rule. In a ruling on October 24, 2018, at page 22797 of the Debates, Speaker Regan stated:

The Parent Act rule, the idea that an amendment should not amend an act or a section not already amended by a bill, rests on a presumption that such an amendment would not be relevant to the bill. This can be true. Often, such amendments attempt to deal with matters not referenced in the bill, and this is improper.

However, there are also occasions when an amendment is relevant to the subject matter of a bill and in keeping with its scope but can only be accomplished by modifying a section of the parent act not originally touched by the bill or even an entirely different act not originally touched by the bill. This is especially so when the amendments are consequential to other decisions taken by a committee or by the House.

● (1020)

The Chair must therefore consider the scope of the bill and review the relevance of each amendment. In doing so, the Chair is bound by the House's decision to adopt the bill at second reading, which fixes the scope of the bill and establishes certain limits on the amendments that may be proposed in committee.

The Chair has therefore carefully reviewed Bill C-12 as adopted by the House at second reading, the amendments in question and their relationship to the relevant parent acts. The Chair will first ad-

dress the amendments that concern the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, before examining the amendment relating to the Oceans Act.

[English]

The Chair notes that Bill C-12 proposes a wide range of amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act across parts 5 through 8 of the bill. In the opinion of the Chair, a close reading of the text of the bill reveals five main legislative objectives in relation to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. These are as follows.

The first is expanding immigration-related information sharing across federal departments and agencies. The second is eliminating the designated countries of origin regime by repealing provisions in the act which authorize the minister to designate certain countries whose claimants would be subject to a different review process. The third is modifying the powers and obligations of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and the Immigration and Refugee Board in determining how refugee protection claims are received, processed and decided upon. The fourth is expanding the Governor in Council's ability to make orders related to suspending or terminating applications and related to cancelling, suspending or varying documents issued under the act. The fifth is creating new ineligibility rules for refugee protection claimants.

The Chair has reviewed each of the amendments in question with a view to determining whether they are within the scope of Bill C-12's legislative objectives.

CPC-8 and CPC-14 together require officers and ministers to issue warrants for the arrest or detention of a person in certain circumstances; however, Bill C-12 does not include amendments to the detention and release process and the issuance of warrants among its legislative objectives.

CPC-13 seeks to limit the time within which a judge must determine the reasonability of a certificate; however, Bill C-12 does not amend division 9 of part 1 of the act, which provides for, among other things, the issuance of certificates of inadmissibility.

CPC-15, CPC-16 and CPC-17 establish additional reporting requirements for the minister in the context of the minister's annual report to Parliament. The Chair notes that CPC-15 includes several reporting requirements, among which is a requirement related to the number and category of documents varied or cancelled. While this aspect of the amendment appears to the Chair as potentially related to Bill C-12's legislative objectives, the Chair has been unable to identify a similar relationship between the other provisions in the amendment and Bill C-12. CPC-16 and 17 would add reporting requirements related to federal benefits received by refugee claimants; however, the bill does not amend provisions related to such benefits.

CPC-30 amends the section imposing penalties related to human trafficking; however, the bill does not amend the act with respect to the enforcement of human smuggling and trafficking, nor with respect to penalties more generally.

Finally, CPC-33 amends the residency requirement for the chairperson of the Immigration and Refugee Board. While the bill does propose certain amendments to the board's exercise of its powers, it does not amend the act with respect to the composition, office and staff of the board.

In the Chair's view, while there may be certain connections between the substance of these amendments and the objectives for the reform of the refugee and immigration system debated by members at second reading and at committee, these amendments are not relevant to the bill's legislative objectives and were correctly ruled inadmissible by the chair of the committee as being beyond the bill's scope. While members may find it tempting to add additional objectives when considering a piece of legislation, these must be in keeping with the scope and the principle of the bill as approved at second reading.

● (1025)

The Chair will now consider the provisions of the bill related to the Oceans Act. Bill C-12 proposes to amend section 41 of the act, with the objective of expanding Coast Guard services to include activities related to security and also to allow the Governor in Council to designate any minister as the minister responsible for Coast Guard services. During its clause-by-clause study of the bill, the committee adopted an admissible amendment to section 41 of the act, CPC-3, to assign responsibility for Coast Guard services specifically to the Minister of National Defence. No one has contested the admissibility of this amendment.

The committee also adopted CPC-2, an amendment adding new clause 24.1 that amends section 40 of the act, a section which is not amended by the bill. CPC-2 removes the responsibility for Coast Guard services from a list of responsibilities of the Minister of Fisheries set out in section 40 of the act. In making this amendment, the committee was resolving an inconsistency between section 40 of the act and section 41 of the act, as amended by CPC-3, where each section would identify a different minister as responsible for Coast Guard services.

After careful review, the amendment to section 40 of the act appears to the Chair to be consequential to the committee's decision to assign responsibility for Coast Guard services to the Minister of National Defence. As a result, my conclusion is that this amendment is within the scope of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading.

[*Translation*]

Consequently, I order that the amendment adding new clause 24.1 be maintained and that the eight other amendments adding new clauses 39.1 to 39.4, 75.1 and 75.2 be declared null and void and no longer form part of the bill as reported to the House. In addition, I am ordering a reprint of Bill C-12 with the removal of the inadmissible amendments. This reprinted version will stand as the official version of the bill for consideration at report stage.

I thank members for their attention

Government Orders

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed from November 27 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.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister said “Who cares?” during his visit to the U.A.E. recently about the state of trade talks with the U.S., he meant it, and here is why.

No one should be naive in thinking that the Prime Minister left a \$1-trillion company, making millions of dollars in both salary and deferred compensations, for some virtuous reason to make \$400,000 as the Prime Minister, to negotiate a trade deal or save us from ourselves. Almost everything in the budget implementation act is set up to use the power of the Prime Minister's Office to benefit a group of well-connected Liberal insiders, lobbyists and the Prime Minister's corporate buddies.

This was a process that started in 2020, when the Prime Minister was appointed as the economic adviser to Justin Trudeau while still acting as chair of Brookfield Asset Management. Having Trudeau in power was a dream come true for the incestuous cabal of Liberal elites. While Trudeau was playing prime minister, the pieces being put into place to ensure that many if not all of the public financial instruments, green investment funds and policies the Prime Minister started pushing when he was pulling Trudeau's strings as his economic adviser aligned with Brookfield's strategy and success.

Last week we found out from Brookfield's chief operating officer that the Prime Minister stands to make millions in carried interest payments from his company's success related to climate and infrastructure schemes he set up. These funds could generate tens of millions of dollars in carried interest for the Prime Minister personally, depending on their performance over the next decade.

However, here is the problem. The Prime Minister knows what he owned before the blind trust was set up. Every time he makes a decision on infrastructure, energy or climate policy, or with tax incentives that are in the BIA, this will help Brookfield in areas where Brookfield is deeply invested. Questions should arise. Is any given policy for Canadians, for Brookfield or for the Prime Minister?

Government Orders

Critics will argue that they have set up a blind trust and an ethics screen, and that this is enough to ensure public confidence and trust, but Brookfield's interest from artificial intelligence, modular housing, carbon capture, nuclear and the transition model of public risk for private return he set up while advising Trudeau will make the Prime Minister millions, and he knows it.

Furthermore, the screen is administered by two political appointees of the Prime Minister. We found out last week that the Prime Minister met with Brookfield executives privately in the Prime Minister's office in October, which would cause a reasonable person to think that the screen is not being wilfully applied, given the fact that the Prime Minister is not supposed to have any interaction with Brookfield, either its people or its entities.

Who cares? We all should, because democracy depends on trust. If Canadians believe that their leaders are making decisions to enrich their companies or themselves, confidence in our institution erodes even more than it has under the Liberals. This is not about partisan politics; it is about accountability. Canadians deserve leaders who serve the public interest, not private portfolios.

My assessment of the budget is simple. For people who support expansive government involvement in every aspect of our economy; subsidies given to companies that would otherwise invest their own capital; Brookfield's deep involvement in policies shaped by its former chair, the current Prime Minister, policies that he and the company stand to gain from; bloating debt and deficits that burden our families, seniors and future generations; and a system that gives Liberal insiders and lobbyists unfettered access to the Treasury while Canada drifts closer and closer towards a kleptocracy, this is the budget—

• (1030)

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, I find it disgusting and somewhat shameful that a member of the Conservative Party continues with character assassination of the Prime Minister.

There are even Conservative MPs, including the deputy leader, who have investments in Brookfield. As opposed to dealing with the substance of legislation and the budget, there is a disgraceful attempt at character assassination, time and time again, by the Conservative Party of Canada. That is how low and dirty its members are in regard to politics.

I ask the member this: When are the Conservatives going to start focusing on Canadian interests as opposed to their own political partisanship?

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, that got the member going. The truth hurts. Actually, everything I said is open source and based on testimony at the ethics committee and on some of the discussions and questions in the House.

The difference is that the Prime Minister holds the levers of power in this country. Every decision he makes can and will benefit him, Liberal-connected insiders and his corporate buddies. When

members of the opposition hold stocks, let us say in Brookfield, they do not hold the levers of power that will enrich themselves.

The truth is the truth, and what I spoke today is the truth.

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like my hon. colleague to continue a bit in this vein. It has clearly touched a pressure point for the government.

We talked a lot about how there is a blind trust, but the fact is that we know the shares remain in Brookfield. That is why policies that directly impact and benefit Brookfield, we know, are helping the Prime Minister.

Therefore, I am wondering if the member could clarify why the blind trust, as established, is not doing an adequate job in stopping the Prime Minister from enriching himself.

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, it is a simple response because the Prime Minister knows precisely what is in that blind trust. He set up the investment schemes, green infrastructure, etc. when he was advising the former prime minister, so he knows full well what is in that blind trust.

The problem is that every policy decision he makes can and will, in some way, impact him and his corporate buddies. The Conflict of Interest Act, which the ethics committee is studying right now, has a massive hole that one could drive a truck through, and this is what the Prime Minister is applying right now, as it relates to the general application rule. He can make broad policy decisions that impact his company and his investments, like the tax credits, for example, in the budget implementation act, or nuclear deals with the United States in Washington, which his company owns.

All this means that the blind trust is not really blind at all to the Prime Minister and that he can, in fact, use his position to influence policy decisions and make millions at the same time.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member opposite represents a rural riding, as do I in Nova Scotia. I do not know how many farmers he may have, but I certainly think about the opposition party, which holds rural seats. I was very disappointed in the platform of the Conservative Party in April. There was not one single policy platform for the agriculture sector.

The member represents a rural riding. I am wondering if he is willing to talk to the leader of the official opposition, the member for Battle River—Crowfoot, to see whether that can be something the Conservative Party actually stands for. I worry it is a constituency that the party has taken for granted.

I am wondering if the member has any comment on that.

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I am very proud to represent the rural part of my riding in Innisfil. We have the largest privately held farm in Ontario and the largest onion farm in Canada.

The policies we put forward would have directly impacted, in a positive way, farming communities. For example, the industrial carbon tax is still applied. Every time those farmers buy equipment, buy fertilizer and buy seed, all of that is applicable and has a cascading effect down the supply chain. The hon. member wonders why food inflation and food insecurity are so great in this country. It is a direct result of the failed economic policies of the government that are affecting farmers at the cost level. Those costs are being applied downstream, as well, to the end consumer.

Therefore, I am very proud of the policies we put forward with respect to agriculture, and I am very proud to represent a riding that has agriculture in it.

• (1035)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise this morning to speak to Bill C-15, which is the budget implementation act. For Canadians at home, these are the actual legal and legislative measures the government is introducing to move forward with what it introduced in the budget. It is a great opportunity to talk about what the government is intending to do to help support the Canadian economy in a difficult time.

It was great to see a 2.6% increase in the GDP in the last quarter and, in the last jobs report, 67,000 jobs added. However, I think I would be remiss if I did not highlight the fact that, given what is happening around the world, the U.S. administration changing its trade policy and tariffs implicating some of the critical sectors in our country, this is not a moment we should take lightly. There is a lot of economic duress that Canadians are facing.

The Prime Minister and the government have been very focused on introducing measures here at home that help grow the Canadian economy and build out resiliency in our trade relationships, in order to make sure we are able to control what happens at home. Yes, we are engaging, as a government and as parliamentarians, as we should be, to make sure we build out trading links around the world, but we have to control what we can do at home.

I am going to use the remaining time I have to highlight three or four areas that I think are extremely important at this moment in time, and that matter.

First of all, I want to talk about defence spending. Now, when the Liberal government took over in 2015, defence spending under the Conservative Party had fallen below 1% of GDP. There were consistent investments in the last government to improve that. I do not think they went far enough. I am very pleased to see, under the new

Government Orders

government and new Prime Minister, a firm and strong commitment to increase defence spending in this country.

We are living in an uncertain world. We see war in eastern Europe. We see war and conflict in the Middle East. We see changes around making sure we can protect our Arctic security. All of that means we have to invest in our men and women in uniform. I think about my aunt, Mary Blois, who served proudly for 30-plus years in the Canadian Armed Forces. I am very proud of her contribution. I am proud of my family's contribution to the Canadian Armed Forces through multiple generations. We as Canadians need to be proud, but we also need to make sure it is not just pride. As parliamentarians, we are supporting measures that increase capacity and support for the Canadian Armed Forces.

That is why the government is investing \$81 billion over the next five years. This is not only to meet our 2% target of GDP spent on defence by the end of this fiscal year. It is also to work toward 3.5% of GDP and an additional 1.5% of GDP that can be connected to defence. This is extremely important.

What does it mean at home in my own riding? I think about 14 Wing Greenwood, Camp Aldershot and the men and women who live in our communities and put on that uniform every day to defend our country. The government has already supported a long-overdue pay increase for the Canadian Armed Forces, and we are building out additional capacity. When I think about 14 Wing Greenwood, I think about the fact that the P-8, the Poseidon aircraft, will be replacing the CP-140. That should be coming online in the next year or two. It will add additional full-time equivalent opportunities at Greenwood, along with the RPAS, a remotely piloted aircraft system. There is a number between 500 and 700 full-time equivalent jobs that will be coming to 14 Wing Greenwood. That is good news for our Canadian Armed Forces. It is good news for 14 Wing Greenwood. It is good news for our communities in the Annapolis Valley.

One of the things I am working on as a parliamentarian, alongside the hon. member for Acadie—Annapolis, is building additional housing. We need to make sure there is requisite housing, of course, primarily for our Canadian Armed Forces members. As the community grows, there is tremendous opportunity in that domain as well. We need to make sure we are there on housing. That will be something I am working for.

It is worth noting that Nova Scotia has 2.5% of the Canadian population, but 20% of the personnel of the Canadian Armed Forces are located in Nova Scotia, and 40% of defence assets in this country are in my home province. That represents a great source of pride but also an opportunity to have, as we build up defence capacity in this country, an ability to grow our communities with it, whether from a procurement perspective or just through additional membership and support for the Canadian Armed Forces. This is something I am going to be working on.

Government Orders

• (1040)

It is also something we need to think through strategically because the existing infrastructure channels and bilaterals do not always take into account the growth that will be forthcoming. I had the opportunity to talk to the Minister of National Defence about this, along with his deputy minister, at the Halifax International Security Forum. It is something we need to do more on, but this is a generational investment. I was certainly disappointed to see some members of the House vote against our Canadian Armed Forces on that measure.

Let us now talk about infrastructure. We have had generational infrastructure investment in Kings—Hants. Our communities are growing, and I certainly take a lot of pride in seeing the resilience of our regional economy in the Annapolis Valley and in Hants County. However, as former County of Kings mayor Peter Muttart said, the infrastructure underground, like waste-water and water infrastructure, is not sexy but sure is essential. If we are looking to build out housing, grow our communities or update existing infrastructure, we need to make sure those programs are in place.

Under the investing in Canada infrastructure plan, the government made significant investment, but we have to make sure it is renewed. This budget contains 51 billion dollars' worth of infrastructure spending, first through the Canada community-building fund, which is a direct transfer through the provinces to municipalities that supports infrastructure across this country.

There is one thing I am very proud of, and maybe not all new members of Parliament know this: For the longest time, the former gas tax fund, now the CCBF, did not allow those municipal transfers to support fire hall infrastructure. I think of all the members' ridings that have volunteer fire departments. This is something we changed to allow municipalities to use that federal transfer to support fire hall infrastructure. Although it may not be needed in Montreal, Vancouver, Toronto and even Halifax, it is sure needed in small communities like Maitland, Brooklyn, Kentville and areas around Canning. There are so many volunteer fire departments.

While I am on my feet, I want to say to the men and women who volunteer their time to protect our communities that we could not be more grateful, which is exactly why we increased the volunteer tax credit, as well, in the last fiscal update.

This infrastructure is going to be important. One of the goals I want to see this infrastructure funding support, through the \$17-billion FPT stream, is a new recreation complex for the County of Kings. This is a project that might be between \$80 million and \$100 million. It will need federal financing. This is something I am focused on and want to get done. As it relates to West Hants and East Hants, some of the areas we are focused on are certainly housing and water development to support our growing communities.

I will make a quick mention of agriculture and forestry. In Kings—Hants, these are extremely important to our regional economy.

Agriculture is mentioned throughout this budget, and we have increased the program commitments. This is extremely important. There are measures in this budget that I highlighted for the member for Barrie South—Innisfil, and I have been chastising my Conser-

vative colleagues throughout this fall session because there was nothing in the Conservative platform for agriculture. Objectively, this is the first time in a long time that the Liberal Party has a better platform for agriculture. This budget delivers on programs that increase business risk management tools and support agri-marketing for export development. I give credit to the Minister of Agriculture, who was in Mexico supporting the development of markets for apples from the Annapolis Valley and beef products from the country. There are good things happening. Conservatives have a bit to answer for as it relates to that question.

On forestry, there are a number of critical supports, including ITCs for biomass and waste, which are really important.

I also want to talk about small businesses. This budget is clarifying the carbon rebate for small businesses, which is important. We are also putting in a productivity superdeduction, which is the ability of small businesses to write off capital expenditures, within one fiscal year, against their taxable income for the types of investments that increase productivity. This is important for small and medium-sized businesses across this country, including in my riding.

The last thing is debt. We will hear Conservatives suggest that the fiscal track is unsustainable, but the Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed that the fiscal track is sustainable. We have a AAA credit rating, which S&P and Moody's put in place. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and the second-lowest deficit in the G7. Also, when the Conservatives were in government in 1990, 35¢ of every dollar was being spent on debt management. Right now, it is less than 10¢. The Conservatives stand up and suggest that the fiscal track is unsustainable, but this is simply not true.

• (1045)

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge that the member in his speech talked about support for the Canadian Armed Forces. I support that 100%. I voted against it because I do not have confidence in the government.

Government Orders

However, what the member did not talk about was that there are clawbacks in the budget to Veterans Affairs Canada, particularly around the indexing of pensions and the way things are calculated. I know veterans on social media and groups that help reach out to veterans in need. There have been clawbacks. In the last 24 hours, one veteran was told he has to pay back \$89,000 to CRA, while another veteran has to pay back \$69,000. For six to nine years, VAC did not do any clawbacks. All of a sudden veterans are being told they need to fix this because this is wrong, and VAC is going after veterans right across the country.

Why does this member support cutting support to our veterans and the Canadian Armed Forces?

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I know the hon. member will make sure that he carries the correct message forward about what is and what is not happening, because there has been a lot out there in the news.

What the government is doing in the budget and proposing is actually just moving the price of cannabis through a medicinal licence from \$8.50 down to six dollars a gram. There has not been any change to the indexing of veterans' pensions. There has been a slight change around the provincial aggregate in terms of what it is. If the member is suggesting there are veterans who have been getting letters asking for \$89,000, I am happy to work across the aisle to get the correct information and make sure we work on that collectively.

Just to be clear, veterans' pensions are going to continue to be indexed moving forward on the basis of either the CPI or the public sector basket of goods, whichever is higher. That has not changed. I hope he can make sure that record is very clear out in the public domain.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague touched on many of the topics and themes in the budget. However, he obviously failed to address the environmental issue, even though the Bloc Québécois was calling on the federal government to stop funding oil companies and instead use the money to fund a green, clean energy transition.

Nuclear waste also has environmental consequences. I want to talk about that. As we speak, my colleague from Repentigny is holding a press conference with representatives from indigenous communities and environmental groups to speak out against transporting nuclear material to the Chalk River site, where it could contaminate a major waterway.

What does my colleague think about that?

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I believe that, along with renewable energies and clean energy, nuclear energy is an essential part of the solution when it comes to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. The nuclear energy sector remains essential for our country, and we have the necessary capacity to provide safe energy. Of course, there is a process in place to ensure that waste disposal is done safely. It is a federally regulated process.

[*English*]

Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would congratulate the hon. member for his wonderful speech.

There is a lot of the steel industry in my riding, especially Stelco, ArcelorMittal Dofasco and National Steel Car. I would like to ask the hon. member what else there is for steelworkers in the budget.

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I know my hon. colleague from Hamilton Centre is a strong champion for the steel sector. When we think about Hamilton, when we think about Sault Ste. Marie and when we think about our communities in Regina and across this country, it is a foundational pillar of the Canadian economy and it is under duress because of section 232 tariffs from the United States.

The government has taken a number of measures, including most recently limiting the ability for steel to be imported from elsewhere around the world. We have measures in place, including around EI, to help support workers who are being impacted. We are focused on a procurement strategy that will be absolutely focused on being able to build out Canadian steel production. It is a difficult time, but the government is focused on what we can do.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, why do you not give the member for Central Newfoundland a question? I would be happy to do that. With UC, I think we should do it.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We are out of time for the hon. member's slot.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South.

● (1050)

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, which represents so much of what we have in this country. We have the larger city of London and rural communities such as Eagle and New Sarum. We have burgeoning communities like St. Thomas, which were once viewed as small farming towns but now are growing to tens of thousands of people, who are coming from all over the country and all over the world.

All of these people have been seeing, under the last 10 years of the Liberal government, how unaffordable life has become. We see it at the grocery store. We see it in housing. Home ownership, which used to be a dream that everyone could rally around, has now become, for so many people, especially young people, a pipe dream. It has become a fantasy. Grocery costs, which we once largely acknowledged had to be paid and could be managed, would maybe be a little more expensive one week and people would clip coupons to save a little bit here and there, but groceries have now become a luxury to some people.

Government Orders

We see this locally. Food bank usage has been on the rise across the country. The St. Thomas Elgin Food Bank expects to have to feed 30,000 mouths this year. That is the third straight year of record demand. That is unsustainable. A society in which people need to use the food bank to fill their fridges and pantries is not a society that is functioning the way it must. What Canadians needed and deserved was a budget that would put affordability front and centre.

As we discuss the budget implementation act, the law that applies the Liberal government's budget to the country, the question I am left with is this: What are the government's priorities, truly?

The Prime Minister, infamously now, a couple of weeks ago, when asked about his conversations with the United States as it pertained to getting a deal for Canada to protect Canadian workers, said, "Who cares?" That has become a rather dismissive response that I think is indicative of how the Prime Minister has viewed many of the concerns facing Canadians, certainly affordability concerns. Most Canadians do not have millions upon millions of dollars of assets and Brookfield stocks to rely on. Canadians have to scrimp and save to get by. Canadians have to deal with these realities in a way that the Prime Minister does not. We also have to deal with the fact that the Liberal government has largely been in the driver's seat for the last 10 years as these problems have ballooned or been aggravated beyond what Canadians can withstand.

I come back to the question of priorities. I have spoken about this budget to more constituents than I can count. People have sent me emails. I have had phone calls, and I have met people in the riding. In fact, someone came up to me at the grocery store and we looked at the products that people are having so much difficulty paying for right now. None of these people have come to me and said that what we need in this country and what they are really concerned about is that Canada does not have Eurovision. No one has said that. Eurovision is in the budget. There is \$150 million for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as "cultural investment" to create a plan for Canada to explore participation in the Eurovision Song Contest.

I realize the Prime Minister is a proud European, but even then, I do not think it is a priority for Canadians. Not one single person has said that is something they believe their hard-earned tax dollars should go toward.

Similarly, no one has told me that they cannot afford groceries, their daughter cannot afford a house and their son cannot find a job, but what would be really helpful is more money for government consultants. It is possible some constituents have told some Liberal MPs that, but not one has ever told me they think we need to give Deloitte more money or that KPMG is really struggling in this economy. However, the Liberal budget has \$26 billion for consultants. That is an increase of just shy of 40%. Maybe the Liberals could hire one of the consultants to come up with a report on how to reduce reliance on consultants. Yes, they did that, and they are still increasing the amount of money they are spending on consultants.

• (1055)

I come back to the question of priorities. We have pointed out that this is an irresponsible budget, a budget that runs up a deficit

of \$78 billion. By definition, a deficit is the government spending money it does not have. It can only collect this from two places. It can take out loans. It can borrow the money and thus increase the debt burden on Canadians, or it can increase taxes. Either way, Canadians are going to have to pay for it. Canadians will pay for it now with their taxes, or they will pay for it next year with their taxes.

We know the debt interest that Canadians have to shoulder, the debt interest Canadians have to pay, is billions upon billions upon billions a year. This year, we are spending more on debt interest than we are collecting in GST revenue. We are spending more on debt interest than we are giving the provinces in health transfers. This is unsustainable.

The \$90 billion in new spending in this budget is about \$5,400 for every Canadian family. Of that, \$1,400 is going to the consultants. Where are Canadians expected to find this money? We are being told that this is generational investment, but it is generational debt. It is money the government is spending now that it does not have and that eventually will come due. It is the next generation and the generation after that, unless there is a course correction, by which I mean a Conservative government, that will be forced to continuously fund the government's reckless credit card debt.

If the government could come to us and tell us what the gain would be, it would be a different story. Again, what do we see? We see more money going to bankers and bondholders. We see more money going to consultants. We see auto jobs fleeing. I spoke yesterday in question period with the industry minister, who promised 40 days ago now a full update from GM on the shuttering of the CAMI plant in Ingersoll, which is not in my riding but employs, or I should say employed, a number of the people I represent. We are 25 days beyond that 40-day deadline and there is no plan. Christmas is coming and more Canadian auto workers are getting pink slips.

The situation is quite grim. GDP per capita is used to gauge differences in living standards across countries. Higher levels of GDP per capita output are generally found in more developed countries, but we have seen that this has not grown in seven years. There has been profound economic decline under the Liberal government's watch. We have often heard in this chamber that this is a "new government". It is a new government that looks an awful lot like the old government, not just in terms of the composition on the benches and in the cabinet, but certainly in the spending.

I did not know it was possible to outspend Justin Trudeau, but I admire the Prime Minister on that achievement, which, again, I never would have thought possible. If he wanted to be in the history books, he has done it. He has outspent Justin Trudeau, one of the most spendthrift prime ministers this country has ever had. Now we ask how Canadians are going to pay for it, how we are going to be forced to fund the government's credit card spending and what the message to the next generation is.

I go back to the Prime Minister's comments to young people just a few weeks back, when he told them they would have to make sacrifices. My background is in media. I was a journalist before I entered the House. I have some breaking news for the Prime Minister: They have been making sacrifices. Youth have been sacrificing, which is why so many young people for the first time in their lives voted Conservative this past election, because they did not believe they had a future under the Liberals. They did not trust the government, under whose watch they could not find a job or buy a house, or trust that it would have their backs moving forward.

These people need more than a government that is going to shrug its shoulders and say, "Who cares?" They need a government that is going to put affordability first, a government that will put their future first and a government that will respect that racking up deficits and debt is not the way we grow a country. Attracting business, attracting investment and allowing for job creation is how we do it.

I do not think Brookfield ever would have put up with the Prime Minister if he were running that company's books the way he is running the country's now. Brookfield actually makes money. Canada right now is losing money. It is not that I am asking the Prime Minister to Brookfield-ize the country, but my goodness, if he is going to be the grand economist he tells us he is, why is he not acting like it?

• (1100)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, coming out of the last federal election just months ago, the Prime Minister made his intentions very clear, and they were to invest in Canada, to invest in Canadians and to make Canada strong, ideally building a country that will be the strongest in the G7. That has been very clear and is reflected in this budget.

We are also trying to grow the economy through trade, whether it is building one Canadian economy or doing a great deal of work with all the premiers, indigenous leaders, territories and so forth. We are also advancing our trade exports beyond the United States. We see a Prime Minister who has proactively travelled to India and the Philippines to ensure that we can expand trade agreements.

Why does the member opposite not understand the overwhelming commitment to build a strong, healthy Canadian economy? Why does he not get behind it and support it?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I am glad our hon. colleague pointed out how much the Prime Minister enjoys travelling. The reality is that Conservatives do support a strong economy, which is why we were saying that we need to get rid of capital gains for profits that are reinvested in Canada. It is why we need to get rid of the consumer carbon tax and the industrial carbon tax. It is why we

Government Orders

need to eliminate the barriers to development and home construction. All of these things are still things that Canada needs.

My response to the hon. member would be, if the Liberals are going to take our ideas, they need to take all of them for the sake of the country.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague gave a great speech on this topic. Every time I listen to him, I feel like I am listening to a podcast. He has very smooth delivery.

I want to ask about Bill C-15 and the fact that it has 45 different sections. If we were to read out all of the titles of the sections within the bill, we would be here for 10 minutes. We have time for a 10-minute speech. Does my colleague have any comments about all of the things in the bill?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I think it is very difficult when a government tries to shoehorn a large suite of changes into a single bill and then turns around to accuse Conservatives of not working on the government's timeline. We need to get it right more than we need to get it done quickly on some of these things.

I will go back to comments I made earlier about the priorities the government has set out. The government found money in the budget for Eurovision and for seizing firearms from law-abiding gun owners. That would cost 700-and-some-odd million dollars, and that is just what the government has acknowledged as the cost of that program. There are going to be other things as well, but the government has not found the time to come up with a plan to save auto jobs. This is a profound mismatch that desperately needs a government that will put affordability, and what ordinary Canadians care about and need, as its first priority.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I have not heard from the Conservative benches about this, and I am hoping the member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South can let me know if there is a view on the part of the Conservative Party to shifting the budget to always being in the fall. I ask this because I am concerned that we will now have a perpetual panic that we cannot have a Christmas election. We are in a minority Parliament and the cry "we cannot have a Christmas election" only works if a budget is always in the fall.

Does the member have any thoughts on that aspect of the Liberal government's handling of the budget?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her question. Given that she voted for the budget and now says she regrets it, maybe more time to review the budget is necessary for all of us.

Government Orders

I do not take a position on the specific timing of the budget, but I do not respect the Liberal government holding the country hostage by saying to the opposition parties that we must pass this or else, and using that as a cudgel to shoehorn reckless spending into what this country is doing. I think that is very irresponsible, and I would be happy to work with my colleague on finding a way to prevent governments from doing that in the future.

● (1105)

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague mentioned in his excellent speech that the GST collected is now going to be less than the entirety of the deficit interest payments we are going to have this year.

Should the Government of Canada change the title of the goods and services tax to the debt servicing tax?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, unlike my colleagues on the Liberal benches, I do not enjoy thinking about taxes all that often, because every time I do, the blood pressure goes up.

I think we need to have a wholesale re-evaluation of government spending. Let us stop looking at Canadians as though they are an endless source of money, or as my Francophone colleagues say, *une vache à lait*.

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Madam Speaker, the previous incarnation of the Liberal government was led by a man who believed that budgets somehow magically balance themselves. He clung religiously to that belief, even after 10 years of watching the deficit get bigger and bigger. No wonder he thought Canadians would forgive him if he did not think about fiscal policy. He obviously did not understand that the government deficit is a debt owed by the Canadian people. It does not magically vanish. It has to be repaid, or the government and the country go bankrupt.

With a change at the top of the Liberal Party, Canadians were hoping to be able to look to Parliament for serious leadership. They voted for a government willing to meet and deal with the challenges our country faces. What they have been given instead is an accounting flim-flam, another record deficit with no plan to pay the money back. We can let our great-grandchildren worry about that, as Canada's national debt has passed the once unfathomable \$1-trillion mark and continues to grow at more than \$4.5 million dollars every hour.

In 10 years, the Liberals have more than doubled the national debt, and what do Canadians have to show for that? Obviously, there is nothing. Bill C-15, budget 2025 implementation act, No. 1, will drive up the cost of living for every Canadian. Whether it is food, home, or anything else, Canadians will pay more.

Just six months ago, the Prime Minister promised to keep the deficit at \$62 billion. When the finance minister announced in his budget that the number had grown to \$78 billion, it was just another broken Liberal promise. There have been so many that the Liberals do not even keep track. Instead of being lowered as promised, the debt-to-GDP ratio is rising and inflation is rising with it. The Prime Minister promised to spend less. Instead, he is spending a lot more. He is spending \$90 billion, which is equal to \$5,400 per household in more inflationary spending.

The Prime Minister promised to help municipalities cut their homebuilding taxes in half, and this costly budget breaks that promise. Higher housing costs are the price of this Prime Minister. The Building Industry and Land Development Association has expressed deep disappointment and concern with the budget's response to the serious crisis impacting the housing sector in Canada's largest municipalities. It seems what once was a promise to deliver 500,000 new homes annually has now become a plan that will cost 100,000 jobs. How is that making things better for Canadians? The question and the answer are with the government.

Earlier this year, the Prime Minister was talking about big plans to improve Canada's economy. He promised more investment. His budget reveals investment is collapsing, and Bill C-15 does nothing to help that. There is consistency here, though. As our health care system is strained and in need of help, once again, the federal government plans to spend more on debt interest than on health care transfers. Anyone who can do basic math would tell us that adding to the deficit and increasing the national debt means less money for health care and the other things Canadians need.

Most people do not like paying taxes because they feel the government is just wasting that money. The attitude is understandable when we realize the Liberals are paying more in interest payments on their record debts than they collect through the goods and services tax. This means that every dollar the federal government collects through GST is going to paying off the Liberal debts. None of it is being used to help Canadians. Nothing in Bill C-15 can hide that fact and that reality.

The Liberals are adding \$321.7 billion to the federal debt over the next five years, more than twice the \$154.4 billion the previous administration planned for the same period. It is double what the previous administration was planning for. Numbers once considered to be unthinkable are introduced with a shrug. There is no plan to put our fiscal house in order. Canadians are going to be paying for Liberal boondoggles for generations to come.

● (1110)

When I look at these numbers, I feel like I am living in a fairy tale. It is not one of those nice Disney fairy tale movies with a happy ending, but a Brothers Grimm tale where, at the end, people get eaten. The Liberals are telling us this is a Disney budget, but the numbers are pretty grim and, like most fairy tales, not believable. We can forget the fancy Liberal words and look at the reality: Bill C-15 does not have a happy ending.

Under the Prime Minister, real GDP has grown by only 1.1% in 2025, which is the second-lowest growth in the G7. The unemployment rate is expected to be at 6.4% over the next five years and Canadians will still suffer from the effects of the job-killing industrial carbon tax.

Government Orders

In the Gospel of Matthew, we are told the story of two men. There was a wise man who built his house on rock. The rain came down, the streams rose and the wind blew and beat against the house, yet the house did not fall because it had its foundations on the rock. What is true in home construction is also true in government spending. The Prime Minister and his minister of finance remind me of the other man in that biblical story, the foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain came down, the streams rose and the winds blew and beat against the house, and it fell with a great crash.

This budget implementation act would firmly build Canada's fiscal house on sand. It is only a matter of time before our fiscal building and our nation crash.

Canadians expect better from the current administration than more broken Liberal promises. It was not even a year ago that the former Liberal finance minister resigned rather than tell Canadians that the deficit would balloon to \$62 billion and that the government had lost control of the finances of the nation. The Liberal Party turned to the current Prime Minister as a saviour, believing his reputation for sound fiscal management. Instead of a plan to get government finances in order, we have a plan to spend, spend, spend and a record deficit for a non-pandemic year. That is not a plan; it is a disaster.

If I had run my business the way these Liberals run the country, I would have gone bankrupt almost immediately. Government is not a business, and I do not expect it to be run like a business, but I do expect it to run with an understanding that today's decisions impact the future. This is taxpayer money that we are entrusted with, and we need to spend it wisely. Deficit spending that adds to the national debt with no plan or hope of repayment is not wise. The Conservatives asked for an affordable budget for an affordable life. Instead, they got reckless spending that would do nothing to make life better for the people of this country.

On behalf of the Canadians whom the Liberals have priced out of food, homes and life, Conservatives will oppose this costly deficit budget that would gamble away Canada's future. Can this bill be fixed? Yes it can, if the Liberals are willing to listen to reason. Canadians need a boost to their take-home pay. They need affordable homes and food. To do that, the Liberals need to end the hidden taxes, cut wasteful spending, open our country to opportunity and get rid of bureaucracy to build affordable homes.

Is the Prime Minister willing to do the work, or to work with everybody, to support a positive, hopeful and affordable future for all Canadians? The question remains with the government and with the Prime Minister.

• (1115)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to deal with a misconception that the Conservatives like to portray. When we look at the G7 countries, such as the U.S.A., France, Germany and so on, we see that Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio the second-lowest deficit to GDP ratio. If the Conservatives were to do a bit of research, not much, they would realize that, when the current leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Conservatives' former caucus, they had the highest

deficit in the last 50 to 60 years, when we factor in the value of the dollar.

I am wondering if the member can provide his thoughts on how he would define hypocrisy related to the Conservative Party of Canada today.

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, I have learned in life to compare myself to the people above me and ahead of me, not to the people behind me.

The government has given us the same story over and over. It talks about the comparison to whatever, such as the comparison to the debt in so many years. All these numbers do not help Canadians with what they deal with on a daily basis. Millions of Canadians are lining up at food banks, and that should be of huge concern to the government, which does not seem to be the case. Canadians cannot afford to buy a home. Canadians cannot afford to even continue to have the standard of living we have always had.

If those are not enough examples for the government to change course over how it does business, that means we are in deep trouble.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the debate. My colleague's speech was wonderful.

Listening to the member for Winnipeg North, it is as if he lives in an opposite world. He will twist and turn and try to make comparisons, but these are the simple facts. Food bank usage in our country is higher than it has ever been; there are more people in Canada using the food banks than ever. With regard to the quality of life index, we were number five in the world, and we are now number 27. How can the member keep telling Canadians how good they have it, when time after time there are job losses, with 1,000 more job losses at Algoma Steel?

The budget is a Brookfield budget that benefits bondholders and bankers, not everyday hard-working Canadians. Can the member please tell me if there is anything in the budget that might make life more affordable for the average hard-working Canadian, or is it all about bankers and bondholders?

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, there is a lot of bad news in the budget. One piece is the \$78 billion of extra deficit, with \$321 billion for the next five years. At any simple level of understanding, we know this has to be paid somehow by Canadian taxpayers and by future generations.

My hon. colleague is correct; the lineups at the food banks are a huge concern. It is something we have not seen in our history. There is the need for housing and the need to at least carry out our day-to-day lives. There are also a number of bankruptcies in the country.

Government Orders

All these are indications in front of us. Any wise person looking at the situation and thinking about what is going on will see that unless we change course, unless things take a different direction, and unless we at least admit we are in trouble and we start facing the issue as responsible people, we are asking for disaster, and that is what we have seen ahead of us.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, it has also been pointed out by the Parliamentary Budget Officer that in the new lingo the Prime Minister uses, “spend less...invest more”, even the invest more part apparently is not true, and not just in a little sense; it is actually close to \$100 billion short of his investment promise.

Can the member speak to the Prime Minister's words? Should Canadians hold him to his word that he is actually going to spend less and invest more?

• (1120)

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, we have been hearing the word “investment” for the last 10 years. There has been more debt and more money to service the debt. It seems as if the government does not want to listen to true numbers, whether they are coming from the PBO or coming from us and from others around the country.

Unless we accept the reality of the last 10 years, including now, we will still be going in the same direction: more debts, more debt service and more deficits for future Canadian generations to carry. If those are not enough warnings, we are in trouble.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and to speak to the budget implementation act. As always, I have themes. Today I am going to pick up on these themes: things I am glad were not in the budget, things I am glad were in the budget, things I wish were not in the budget, and things I wish were in the budget. I will start with the things I am glad were not in the budget.

The first is the capital gains tax on people's house equity. This was a policy that had been floated in previous Liberal platforms. The Prime Minister said he was not going to include it. I am glad it is not there, because the equity people have in their home is typically part of their retirement plan. As we have an aging population, the government needs to keep its hands off our pensions and our home equity.

The second thing I am glad not to see in the budget is two of the recommendations that came from the finance committee: recommendation 430, which would have revoked charitable status for faith-based organizations; and recommendation 429, which would have revoked charitable status for pregnancy crisis centres.

There is no way the government could afford to provide the service and compassion that faith-based organizations are providing across the country, so I am really glad to not see recommendation 430 in the budget. I am just concerned that it was even supported by the Liberals to come forward from the finance committee. However, it is part of a continuing war on people of faith in this country, as we see playing out right now in Bill C-9, in which the government is co-operating with the Bloc to remove the protections, under

the Criminal Code with respect to hate speech, for people of faith to be able to express themselves and read their scriptures.

I do not really know where the Liberal government thinks it is going with this, as 65% of Canadians are people of faith. To try to remove their charter rights to freedom of religion seems counter-productive. I hope the government will rethink that, but I was really glad not to see it show up in the budget.

With respect to revoking the charitable status for pregnancy crisis centres, I will say that the Liberals are always talking about a woman's right to choose. However, if women really have a right to choose, then some of them are going to choose to have babies, and they are going to need pregnancy crisis centre supports. Therefore I am glad to see that recommendation 429 did not make it into the budget.

The other thing I am glad we did not see a lot of in the budget is the huge spending we have been doing. Last year, \$20 billion went to foreign nations for what I would consider to be frivolous and ideological stupidity: gender-just rice, for example. There was also \$4 million sent off to Lebanon for multigender accessibility. Honestly, there are Canadians here in this country who are lined up at food banks and cannot afford to live. The priority has to be for Canadians, so I am glad to see that none of those things I mentioned made it into the budget.

Now I will talk about the things I am glad were in the budget.

The first thing I am going to say, and these are probably the only nice comments I am going to make today, is about the building communities fund: \$50 billion over five years for a number of things that are supposed to build infrastructure to get us to build affordable housing. That will be really important in my riding. For example, we need storm sewer upgrades in Brooke-Alvinston; stormwater upgrades in Warwick, Watford and Arkona; potable water for Kettle & Stony Point First Nation; a stormwater system expansion in Lambton Shores; and waste water upgrades in St. Clair Township and for Point Edward. Our priority in Sarnia—Lambton is to build affordable housing; this is the infrastructure we need, so I will be petitioning the minister to try to get some of the funding we need in our riding.

That was one thing I was glad to see.

Government Orders

The other thing I would say I was glad to see is \$600 million of stable funding for the status of women. If we look at the current situation in our country, which is especially important during the 16 days of activism for battling gender-based violence and as we approach the anniversary of the École polytechnique murders, we see that under the soft-on-crime Liberal policies, every other day there is a femicide in our country. Sexual assault is up 76%. Women make up about half the population, so absolutely there should be a priority on addressing that. I am happy to see some stable funding for it.

Now I will move on to the things I wish were not in the budget.

● (1125)

Let us start with the \$78-billion deficit. I do not know how the Liberals cannot understand that every time this kind of deficit spending is put into a budget, it pours fuel on the inflationary fire and drives up the cost of absolutely everything. People simply cannot afford that.

It also results in having to pay a lot more to service the debt. We will be paying \$100 billion a year to service just the interest on the debt. It is like lighting up that money every year. Let us think about it. That is more money than we put into our health transfers. Now think of what could be done if we were not paying off our debt, if we actually had some fiscal prudence.

The other thing I am not happy about is that we are going to build, build, build, but that what we are really building in the budget is bureaucracy. Instead of buying F-35s, we will build a defence procurement bureaucracy. We do not need that; we need to buy things that are going to help our NATO allies and put us in a place where we can defend our sovereignty.

We are also building a fourth bureaucracy. How many billions of dollars have we wasted creating housing bureaucracies that do not result in building houses? Housing starts are down again. I do not like that.

With respect to the major projects bureaucracy, I am a fan of building major projects, but the Liberals have not built a major project. There have been a lot of announcements about projects that were already under way, and now the Liberals are building a huge bureaucracy. The government has shown it is terrible at major projects. It took the \$4.5-billion Kinder Morgan pipeline and delivered it for \$30 billion, two years late. That is the kind of record the government has. It does not need more bureaucracy.

Then there is the Canada Infrastructure Bank. The government decided to give it another \$10 billion. It is a bank that took \$35 billion from municipalities and has not really built many projects. In fact last year it spent \$4 million building projects, \$38 million on salaries and \$9 million on bonuses, and it had \$204 million in losses. Why would the government put more money into this kind of failing mechanism?

Another thing I was unhappy to see in the budget is that the government has put our Canada pension plan in the asset part of the government. Those are not government assets; those are the assets of Canadians. Canadians and employers have paid into that program. I really worry that when the government gets its hands on

something like that, it is going to spend it, as it does with everything else.

I also want to highlight some of the frivolous spending I still see happening. It is happening with consultants. Even though the government said it was going to try to spend less, it is spending more. The government is still spending money on what I would call frivolous items, such as \$150 million for gender awareness in other countries, \$150 million to UNRWA that has been proven to be helping Hamas build tunnels and \$500 million for the European Space Centre, 50% of which is owned by Brookfield. We are seeing lots of good deals for Brookfield and not too many good deals for Canadians.

With that said, here are some things I wish were in the budget. The first is something for seniors. In my riding, that is over half the population. We have an aging population in our country, but there is just a reannouncement of the new horizons program. How about an increase to OAS and GIS?

How about something for young people? There was just a small amount for training, after the government cancelled the apprenticeship program. We need more people in the trades.

I wish the government had actually put something in the budget to build houses and to buy the F-35s, as well as money for jails for all the criminals, including repeat offenders and violent people out on the streets.

I will wrap up by talking about spending less to invest more. The government is actually spending more. Public sector spending is up, and the cost of consultants is up. We know this is going to cause the cost of everything to go up. The government should instead be focusing on creating a competitive environment, on R and D, on reducing regulations, on getting certainty so investors will come invest here in Canada, and on getting out of the way. The government says it is going to build at rates never before seen, but sadly we have seen zero before. We do not need to see it again.

● (1130)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Conservative argument around deficit spending and inflation was completely proven wrong when they said the same thing about the carbon tax. They said that the carbon tax was adding to inflation. The parliamentary secretary and I listened to this for years in the House. Then we got rid of the carbon tax, and inflation did not suddenly get impacted by this.

Government Orders

Notwithstanding that whole issue, the reality is this: What the member is saying is just not correct. I know we both went to the same university. She studied engineering. I studied economics. Take it from the person who studied economics that her rationale for fuelling inflation with deficit spending, which might work in theory in an isolated economy, does not apply in the same way when we have open borders for trade. The reality is that there is so much more that impacts an economy and inflationary pressures.

Notwithstanding the fact that this does not play into the Conservative narrative we heard here for years, can the member explain to me how global economies and free trade affect inflationary pressures the same way she is telling me deficit spending affects inflationary pressures?

Marilyn Gladu: Madam Speaker, I certainly recall the member opposite mocking this side of the House for 10 years on the carbon tax. Then we noticed, during the election, the price of gasoline start to fall. What did the Liberals do afterwards? They returned and put an industrial carbon tax in place, the supposed new fuel standard that increased the cost of gasoline 17% and continues to increase the amount needed to grow the food, move the food and sell the food, so they are driving inflation.

If we look at this in comparison with our neighbours to the south, food prices here are going up 40% faster than those in the U.S. because of the government's policies.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, in her speech, my colleague talked about the government's frivolous budget spending at a time when Canadians are paying a lot more for food and other consumer goods because of inflation.

One of those frivolous expenses is the carbon capture, utilization and storage investment tax credit. Alberta's major oil companies made record profits from 2022 to 2024, and 60% of those profits went to shareholders in the United States. Now, we are going to pay to produce net-zero oil, which is a total pipe dream.

Would my colleague go so far as to say that it is foolish to continue to financially support the greedy oil and gas industry in the budget?

Marilyn Gladu: Madam Speaker, that is a good question.

I do not support the Pathways Alliance project, because I think that all of the companies involved are simply looking to become very wealthy, and Brookfield is one of them. I do not believe that this will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada.

We need to build a pipeline, and we need to sell our oil around the world. That is the right response.

[*English*]

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think my hon. colleague mentioned this in her speech, and I am wondering if she can clarify it a little more: Part 5, division 3 of this bill talks about \$1.5 billion for the Canada Lands Company.

I thought this was a company that was supposed to sell off federal assets. Why are we giving it money to do that?

• (1135)

Marilyn Gladu: Madam Speaker, the government's promise was that it was going to sell off land so it could build the affordable housing we are missing because of massive immigration that did not match the supply of housing.

Here we go. We see, again, that the government is giving money. Who is getting rich? That is always the question with the Liberals. It is corruption. It is Brookfield. The Prime Minister is getting rich.

I am not certain exactly which Liberal insider is getting rich on this one.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to see you in the chair, but I am not so pleased to speak to Bill C-15. It will come as no surprise to anyone when I say that, unfortunately, the Bloc Québécois will not be supporting Bill C-15. We are making an effort to ask for changes, compromises and things for Quebec, but we are getting very few answers.

Our key demands were left out of the budget entirely. I will get back to that at the end of my speech if I have any time left. I will just remind members that we asked the government to reimburse Quebecers for the money that was given to the other provinces for the carbon tax, and we also asked for an increase in old age security starting at age 65. The government could have made an effort to address these two demands at least. There is also the issue of transfers. Perhaps I will get back to that later.

Bill C-15 is a colossal bill. It is 650 pages long, contains 80 measures and amends 49 acts in a whole host of areas. I read it again yesterday evening, point by point. It is fortunate that there was a great football match on, because some sections of the bill were putting me to sleep.

This is a big bill. The problem with big bills is that we often have to sift through the document to find out if the government has slipped something in. The big surprise this year comes around page 300 or so. I will get back to that later. I hope there are people tuning in who will hear this and realize what the government is doing. The government is giving just about any minister the authority to exempt projects from the application of just about any legislation for as long as the minister wishes. All the minister has to say is that doing so will encourage innovation.

We do want to be productive and efficient, but the government needs to be careful. The only act that the minister cannot grant an exemption for is the Criminal Code. However, there are many other acts. We are concerned about the environment, among other things. It will come as no surprise when I say that we are now pretty much alone on that. Fortunately, our member from Repentigny has taken over from Ms. Puzé, whose name I can mention in the House today because she is no longer here. She proudly carried the torch high for many years. I wish to send her my regards.

Government Orders

In terms of the environment, things really are not heading in the right direction. The government is extending the tax credits for carbon capture. It is giving more money to the oil and gas industry. Carbon capture is an unproven technology. It has been tried in other places and it does not work. This will be a fiasco. The government knows this but it is plowing ahead anyway, because this is a government that is all about image. The government members give nice speeches. They know it will not work, but it is no big deal. They announce they are going to do it because it is good for the environment. In two, three, four or five years, people are going to realize that it does not work, but that is okay, because the government can score political points with it right now. That is the sad state of politics today.

Small nuclear power plants are now included in the clean energy tax credit. That is unbelievable. The government has decided that nuclear energy is clean energy. We understand that some countries rely on it, because they do not have enough land or do not have other sources of energy. However, it cannot be said that nuclear energy does not produce waste. The cherry on top is that the waste from these small nuclear power plants will be dumped at Chalk River, on the banks of the Ottawa River, which provides drinking water for the vast majority of Quebeckers. This worries us.

In fact, my colleague from Repentigny is meeting with local residents today about this issue. We are trying to wake up the government and the Conservative opposition regarding this issue. If an incident occurs someday and Quebeckers' drinking water becomes contaminated, who is going to pay, and who is going to live with the consequences for decades? It will be us. This is very serious.

The government decided to have more nuclear energy, because it decided that it is clean energy. That is absurd. Furthermore, the tax credits initially intended for the manufacturing sector now include liquefied natural gas conversion. To put it briefly, the goal is production. "Drill, baby, drill" is a well-known phrase that is being repeated more and more in Parliament. It is appalling.

• (1140)

The government is also going to make the media crisis worse by getting rid of the digital services tax for good. That is another serious negative consideration. I will get back to that in more detail if I have more time, but it is quite surreal to see the current government capitulating to the U.S. government on everything. It capitulated on every issue and got nothing in return. It gave and gave and gave because well, we are nice and polite and so we give. However, there comes a time when we must stand firm, no matter how big our neighbour is. By getting rid of the digital services tax, the government is forgoing \$7.2 billion over five years. That is a lot of money for our newsrooms. It is a lot of money for media companies like TVA, which laid off a lot of workers recently.

We asked about this issue here in the House. I was there, so I can attest to that. The former minister, who has now left, was answering our questions. That former minister quit because he is also outraged by what this government is doing in terms of the environment. At least we are starting to attract followers from other political parties.

However, when we ask questions about the media, the government says CBC/Radio-Canada got money. The government is

telling us the media model it wants in Quebec and Canada is a state monopoly. There is no support for private and independent media.

What can I say about regional news? It is crazy that it is not getting any help. The government needs to do something to support these people. We are living in an era when technology is evolving, artificial intelligence is moving at lightning speed, and fake news is becoming easier to produce and is circulating more and more quickly. While all this is happening, the government is telling private media they must sort out their own problems and that if they are not profitable, they should just close down.

Perhaps it suits the government to have an uninformed population. That way, no one will go digging through this enormous bill to find page 300. Hiding somewhere near the middle of the bill is a measure which, as I mentioned a bit earlier, allows any minister to suspend any law for any period of time he or she chooses. The text of the bill even states that it is the minister who decides on the period of time. I was quite surprised to see this in the bill, and I had to read this passage a second time to be sure I had read it correctly.

That is not all. The stated goal is to encourage innovation. If an experiment is under way, the application of a law can be suspended. However, when the experiment is finished, the exemption can be maintained. It is no big deal. Any excuse can be made to cancel laws, and no one knows when they will be reinstated. That is outrageous. I would even use the word "dangerous" to describe this government. I think that in five or 10 years, people are going to look at the outcomes of this government's policies and they are going to realize that democracy has taken a big step backwards. Bills C-5 and C-15 are perfect examples. Democracy will have declined and we will be stuck with these changes.

The people most in need have been completely left out. Yesterday, I spoke about tax cuts. Everyone is making nice speeches about this. They say they are cutting taxes, it is going to be good and it is going to be great, when in reality we are talking about \$4 a month. The least well off, including disability benefit recipients, are going to see an increase in their tax burden. We are supposed to applaud this and be happy about it.

Here is a scoop for everyone: We are not going to applaud. In a 650-page document, there might be a few worthwhile measures. I hope the Liberals found one or two that might be good, such as the eligible credits for critical minerals, which could be beneficial for Quebec, or things like that. We are going to watch to see what might be good. As for the rest and what comes next, we are going to work conscientiously. However, I can say that when the time comes to vote, we are going to vote against Bill C-15.

• (1145)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech. I must admit that I missed part of it. Still, I was a bit surprised that I did not hear him talk about the measures in the budget for the agriculture and agri-food sector, given that I know that my hon. colleague represents a rural riding in Quebec that has a lot of farmers.

Government Orders

The budget includes \$120 million to enhance business risk management programs, as well as an additional \$75 million for the AgriMarketing program, which is crucial in helping us export Quebec and Canadian products around the world. There are also millions of dollars in investments for the Canadian Food Inspection Agency to promote free trade in general.

Why is my colleague going to vote against measures that are important for Canadian and Quebec farmers, including those in his riding?

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from Kings—Hants, with whom I enjoy speaking every day. A budget is a complex set of measures. Yes, this budget contains a few minor measures that may be good for agriculture, and I have already applauded them.

However, I would invite my colleague to reread his budget, especially the part where the government announces funding for the AgriStability program. When we look carefully at the budget lines, we see that they include investments of \$8 million or \$23 million. I would have to double-check the exact amount. Then on the next line, we see the exact same amount being deducted because the government is taking the money from inside the system.

The government is making nice announcements and promises, but Canada, a G7 country, is still dedicating less than 1% of its budget to support agriculture. Meanwhile, it is planning to invest 5% in defence. We agree with putting money toward defence, but only to a certain point. Can we eat before we start fighting? Can we ensure that we are self-sufficient when it comes to food?

There is a lot of work to be done. The government could make the advance payments program permanent by setting a limit of \$350,000. I would like to hear the government talk about permanent measures, but instead it is implementing temporary measures. Do members know why? It is because the government likes it when farmers have to come and beg to have the measures renewed every year. That makes the government feel powerful. If the government really wanted to help people, it would implement permanent measures.

[English]

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, there is finally something that I and the Bloc member agree on: this ridiculous idea of pumping air into the ground, or the \$16-billion landfill, as I call it.

I am wondering if the hon. member understands that there is probably a Brookfield connection to this pipeline.

[Translation]

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we agree on something, and I invite my colleague to make the most of this occasion. Let us put this date on the calendar. We will be more inclined to like each other the next time we talk.

As to the use of tax havens, the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, among others, is looking into that, and the more they dig, the more suspicious the Prime Minister's investments look. Naturally, when the government adopts mea-

asures and eliminates taxes for companies that benefit the individual in the position of prime minister, that raises very serious questions.

That will go down on the record I was talking about earlier. In five or 10 years, people will look at what this government did. They will say that it was just not right and that it must never happen again.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am disappointed in the Bloc's approach to the budget implementation bill. Its members are not going to be voting in favour of it and have made that very clear. There are many things in the budget implementation bill that would be of benefit to the people of Quebec and, indeed, all of Canada.

I wonder if the member could reflect on many of the initiatives that are taking place, such as the Port of Churchill, investments for seniors and so forth. These are in the budget implementation bill the Bloc members are voting against. Does the member have any remorse over wanting to prevent residents of Quebec from receiving benefits?

• (1150)

[Translation]

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I have no regrets, and the reason I say that is because I attended a FADOQ event over the weekend and people told me not to abandon them. They know that the government has not yet agreed to increase OAS for seniors aged 65 and over, as demanded by the Bloc Québécois, so they are asking us not to abandon them. They feel as though everyone else is abandoning them. That is what seniors in my riding are telling me.

I would not want my colleague to take this personally because I like him, but when he is disappointed, it usually means that I am doing my job well. It means that I am defending the right things. The Bloc Québécois will continue to defend Quebec's interests as well as environmental issues. My colleague can talk about the budget and the new measures all he wants, but he knows what I am talking about. He just lost his heritage minister, who is an environmentalist, so he knows.

* * *

[English]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties. If you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

that the House concur in the procedure and House affairs committee report tabled earlier this day.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving of the motion will please say nay.

Government Orders

[Translation]

There being no dissenting voice, it is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

[English]

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, there have been discussions among the parties. I believe that, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to revert back to tabling committee reports.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving of the motion will please say nay.

[Translation]

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights in relation to the motion adopted on Thursday, November 20, regarding Parliament's unwavering commitment to protect children from sexual exploitation.

This was a very important motion, and we proceeded with a very rigorous debate in this committee. We understand that numerous figures in this country, including provincial premiers, have called on the federal government to invoke the notwithstanding clause and reinstate mandatory minimum sentences for those who traffic in and view child sexual exploitation and abuse material. This committee wanted to send a very strong message that the House has no tolerance for that and is calling on the government to bring this back.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The member is supposed to only table the report and not comment on it. I will give him a little tolerance due to the fact that he was elected only recently.

It is so tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today on behalf of the great people of Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford.

I come from a very entrepreneurial riding. Right now in Canada, small businesses are under real pressure: rising costs, persistent inflation and complex regulations. Across Canada, 30.5% of small business firms with fewer than 20 employees reported lower revenues last year and over 20% worry about cash flow. Confidence is slipping. Only 58% of small business owners feel optimistic about 2025, down 10 points from last year. In British Columbia, insolvencies surged 65% in 2023 and major failures continued through 2024, hitting sectors like construction, hospitality and manufacturing hard. This reflects a declining entrepreneurial spirit in Canada.

I met with the president of the Business Development Bank of Canada yesterday evening. She reported an alarming statistic: Canada has 100,000 fewer entrepreneurs today than it did in the year 2000, despite our population growing by over 10 million people since that time. This is described as an “alarming decline” by the Business Development Bank of Canada. In 2000, about three out of every 1,000 Canadians started a new business annually. By 2022, that rate had fallen to 1.3% per 1,000 people, a drop of more than 50%. Today, there are approximately 3.5 million entrepreneurs in Canada, but the pace of new business creation slowed significantly during and after the pandemic.

That brings me to budget 2025. This budget purportedly lays out a broad plan to restructure the Canadian economy, boost investment and improve confidence in how we operate as a country, but I do not believe it achieves its objectives. This budget, in my view, is a series of piecemeal wins, not the structural reform Canada needs to see in order to address the very real challenges we face in 2025.

In my 10 minutes today, I will address three areas where I believe we could have seen more improvement and focus from the government.

The first is internal trade, the ability of Canadians to trade between provinces and territories. My belief is that the Prime Minister failed to show real leadership in dismantling the internal trade barriers that continue to stifle Canada's economic potential. These barriers cost billions in lost productivity and limit opportunities for businesses and workers across provinces. The Prime Minister has both the authority and the responsibility to convene the provinces and territories and demand progress on the issue where provincial or territorial jurisdiction needs to be amended. Canadians expect a federal government that does not just talk about economic growth but will also use its leadership to take decisive action and make it happen. Canadians of all political stripes agree that this is something we can be doing as a country.

Government Orders

Just imagine how much stronger our economy would be today if there was alignment on transportation rules, if wine growers in British Columbia could supply all provinces and territories with our great agricultural products, and if doctors could practise their profession in any province or jurisdiction without having to go through another regulatory process to be certified in another province or territory. The Prime Minister, by this time, could have made all those things happen. Indeed, he promised that he would, but he did not deliver in the very document that he said would address those major failings in Canada's economic structure.

• (1155)

The second issue is regulatory reform.

Canadians are tired of watching 10 lost years of economic development with a government set on tying our economy in knots with endless layers of regulation. The government created the Major Projects Office in recent months, an agency meant to fast-track approvals and coordinate development, as if adding another layer of bureaucracy will somehow fix the mess of our country. The irony is staggering. Instead of repairing a broken regulatory system, they keep building new structures to work around it.

The Prime Minister's strategy will not work for the entirety of Canada's economy. Under this approach, the Prime Minister gets to hand-pick which projects receive a concierge-style fast-track approval, projects he deems politically or economically convenient, while others remain buried under red tape. That is not leadership; that is favouritism.

The Arctic economic corridor, or the Grays Bay port and road project, is a perfect example of what is at stake. This project could unlock billions in private sector investment, strengthen northern sovereignty and create critical infrastructure for trade and resource development, yet despite its strategic importance, the government allocated zero funding for it in budget 2025. That omission, in my opinion, shows how disconnected the government is from the real opportunities that could drive growth and security for generations to come.

The government claims it wants to double Canadian exports in the next 10 years. That is a wildly ambitious goal, yet its policies make it nearly impossible to achieve. It cannot double exports when it refuses to build the infrastructure that moves goods to markets. It cannot grow the economy by layering on more bureaucracy, instead of clearing the path for investment and development. It cannot double exports if it leaves in place our flawed environmental review process, which has slowed direct foreign investment and Canadian investment and turned it to other rich jurisdictions like Qatar.

If we truly want to see oil and gas infrastructure, critical minerals infrastructure and major projects built in this country, the answer is not a Major Projects Office or more government. It is the opposite; it is less. We need to dismantle the barriers. We need to cut the red tape and we need to empower the private sector to do what it does best, which is to create jobs and build the prosperity Canada wants to see from its federal government and for its people.

The third issue is the affordability crisis.

Canada's affordability crisis runs deeper than the inflation crisis that we face today. It is a structural failure of our tax and wage systems. The Parliamentary Budget Officer notes that the Liberal tax cut would save the average family about \$280 next year, a modest relief that would do nothing, however, to address the systemic complexity of fairness in our taxation system. What Canada needs right now is a royal commission-style review of the entire tax system, similar to Australia's repeated "root and branch" inquiries, including the landmark Henry review, which produced over 130 recommendations to modernize and simplify their tax framework. Without such a comprehensive overhaul in Canada, we will continue to patch holes while wages stagnate and costs soar. To make our economy work, employment must pay, which means reforms that boost productivity, raise incomes and ensure that work provides a real path to affordability, not just token tax breaks.

In closing, Canada's economic future depends on bold structural reforms, not half measures or winners and losers. We must tear down internal trade barriers that fragment our market and cost billions in lost productivity. We need real regulatory reform that clears the path for investment and infrastructure, not more layers of bureaucracy that slow progress and breed favouritism. We must confront the affordability crisis with a comprehensive overhaul of our taxation system.

If we fail to act decisively, the numbers I outlined in respect to declining entrepreneurship will only continue to go in the wrong direction. So much needs to be taking place in Canada and this budget missed the mark on the hard choices Canadians wanted to see from the Prime Minister.

• (1200)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the individual talked a lot about Abbotsford and relief support for Abbotsford. It was a significant issue that the government gave a great deal of attention to. Having said that, he wanted us to spend more on the issue of disaster relief. He is nodding his head in the affirmative.

Within this budget, we will have generational change with \$350 million to strengthen Canada's response to and preparedness for emergencies. I wonder if he realizes that he is actually voting against something he wanted to see put into the budget. Could he provide his qualified support for that?

Government Orders

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, I do not even think \$350 million would address the pump issues we are facing on Sumas Prairie. The former prime minister, Mr. Trudeau, made a promise to the people of Abbotsford, and to all regions of British Columbia that suffered the most catastrophic floods four years ago, that the government would have their backs. Yes, we did receive \$5 billion in the 2021 fall economic statement to address the repairs that needed to be done. Nothing since that point has been committed by the government to upgrade our infrastructure so we can withstand future natural disasters.

I would remind the member for Winnipeg North that CN Rail, CP Rail, the Southern Railway, the Abbotsford International Airport, Highway 1 and all goods going to the port of metro Vancouver flow through my constituency. We are the future of Canada's economy and the government does not recognize it.

● (1205)

[Translation]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I asked my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong a question earlier about carbon capture and storage and the outrageous amounts of tax credits that will be handed out to the greedy oil industry in the budget. She told me that she was personally against that.

I wonder if that is the official position of my Conservative colleagues. I respectfully submit the following question to my colleague: Does he also oppose the tax credits for carbon capture and storage in the budget?

[English]

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, with respect to carbon capture and storage, it is one tool among many that can improve Canada's competitiveness in the oil and gas sector. I visited some of the leading technology firms that we have in British Columbia working on this important issue.

That said, the primary point of my speech was that this budget missed the key points needed to address the structural reforms in Canada's economy that would give all of Canada a leg up and all of Canada a platform for success. This budget did not do it; it picked winners and losers.

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague was speaking to the CPA in me when he mentioned tax reform. However, I wanted to say that during my 26 years as a CPA in public practice, I also noticed, without actually documenting it, the decline in the number of entrepreneurs starting out.

Can my colleague comment on what he thinks would be helpful from the Conservatives' platform to help out small businesses starting out and moving forward?

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, there is a correlation between government regulations that limit resource development and extraction in Canada and the number of small businesses. If we ignore the portion of our economy that actually generates wealth and creates income for Canadians, we are going to see a precipitous decline in the number of small businesses.

In the Fraser Valley, the heartland of agricultural production in Canada, we still have so many businesses tied to mineral explo-

ration and to aerospace manufacturing. They are all tied to the benefits that Canada has been given with respect to critical minerals, oil and gas. If we do not look at reforming our environmental reviews, we will continue to see a decline in the entrepreneurial spirit in Canada, which was so fruitful for so many years and, unfortunately, has seen a precipitous decline under the Liberal government.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these Liberals like to try to call this a generational budget. I guess if we look at the generations of young Canadians it is going to take to pay off the massive deficit in this year's budget and the accumulated debt after 10 years of the Liberal government, it is in fact generational because it will take generations of Canadians to try to make a dent in paying it off.

All of the debt that was accumulated from 1867 until 2015, these Liberals have managed to double in 10 years. Think about that for a second. All the debt accumulated from every government from 1867 to 2015, the Liberals more than doubled in the last 10 years and that is debt that is going to have to be repaid by generations of young Canadians who are going to suffer through higher taxes, higher inflation, higher interest rates, all the things that come with this excess spending by the Liberal government.

If they also want to talk about a generational budget, this generational budget would deliver generational job losses. We look at job losses in the auto sector and the job losses in the steel sector. We just had the announcement of 1,000 job losses yesterday in the steel sector. This is the result of specific policies and decisions made by the government. We can look at the generational devastation in the softwood lumber industry, which the current government has been unable to resolve in eight years of government. If members recall, under the government of Stephen Harper, the softwood lumber dispute was resolved within six months of that government's taking office. Now we are looking at eight years and we are looking at tens of thousands of jobs lost, mills closed, etc.

If we also look at generational opportunities for corruption, then this budget is also generational. The Liberals have decided that the best way to spur the Canadian economy is to set up a special office and the Prime Minister will pick certain projects that will get special status. These are the people who brought us the WE Charity scandal, the green slush fund and many other scandals over the past years. All of these things have been a boon to Liberal insiders, who get rich on these schemes.

These are three ways in which, I guess, this budget is generational, but generationally bad and would cause generations of damage to the country I love and all Conservatives love.

Government Orders

Let us talk a bit about some of those specifics. We now have 1,000 job layoffs in the steel industry in addition to other layoffs that have happened in the steel industry over the course of the current government. The Liberals are going to say it is caused by the tariffs from President Trump in the United States. Sure, that is one factor, and it would be great if that were to be resolved, but we have a Prime Minister who said, “Who cares?” and that is “boring”. If members wonder why we have not actually solved the trade dispute with the United States, which has now cost 1,000 job layoffs in the steel industry, it is because we have a Prime Minister who so casually says “Who cares?” and that is “boring”.

This is the result of “Who cares?” and that is “boring” when we are talking about our largest trading partner, but it does not stop there. Let us look at what is happening in the auto industry. We have now lost production at the Brampton assembly plant and others could be facing the same fate because, once again, the tariffs that are put on our auto sector by President Trump have not been resolved by the Prime Minister. Some of us might recall that it was the Prime Minister who said that he would have a deal by July 21. The last time I checked my calendar, I saw we are quite past July 21. Again, if I go back to when the Prime Minister says, “Who cares?” and that is “boring” when asked about whether he has met with President Trump to resolve the tariffs, members might understand why they blew past July 21 and we are now into December with no resolution on these things.

If we want to talk about the softwood lumber industry, this has been absolutely devastating for communities across the country. Again, this has not been resolved in eight years. From Justin Trudeau who did absolutely nothing to resolve the softwood lumber dispute, we now have a Prime Minister who says, “Who cares?” and that is “boring”. Wait a minute. That was just with respect to the tariffs that the President recently put on steel, aluminum and autos. I do not think softwood lumber even reaches the issue plate for him. It is even below, “Who cares?” and that is “boring”. That is what the Prime Minister is saying to all those families and communities who rely on these industries: “Who cares?” and that is “boring”.

• (1210)

One thing I want to comment on is that the Liberal industry minister has stood up many times and said there was a jobs guarantee in these contracts. I had the opportunity to sit in on the OGGO committee and look at these contracts. Now, I cannot speak about the specifics of those contracts because they cannot be released, but what I can say is that if I had drafted a contract like that for a project when I was in my second year of law school, I would have gotten an F. This is the Government of Canada allegedly signing a contract to give a corporation \$15 billion. Again, if I had turned in that contract in my second year of law school, my contracts professor would have given me an F, and that is what we get with these guys. We do not get things that are good for the Canadian economy.

Let us talk about the second generational thing in this budget, which is the generational debt the Liberals are going to be adding onto every single Canadian. There is \$78 billion this year, although the PBO estimates that it will be even higher. As I said earlier, there is the debt of successive governments from 1867 to 2015, which is one chunk of debt, but from 2015 to 2025, the Liberals doubled it.

Let us think about that. Let it sink in. What took over 100 years to accumulate, the Liberals doubled in 10 years.

The voters in my riding ask me all the time, “Kyle, what is actually better after all of this spending?” Is health care better? No. We have waiting lists that are completely unacceptable. We now spend more money on interest on the debt, which is like making the minimum payment on a credit card. We pay more money servicing the interest on the debt than we do on health transfers to the provinces. This is the effect of piling generational debt onto Canadians and the next generation of Canadians. These are significant problems.

What else is better? Are our armed forces better equipped? No, they are not. Is the cost of living less? No, it is not. Is it easier to buy a house? No, it is not. Are our roads less congested? No, they are not. When we think about doubling the national debt in 10 years and ask Canadians if anything is better, and their answer is, “I cannot think of anything that is better,” we have to ask ourselves what the heck these guys did with all of this money.

We get dribs and drabs of this. We had a great intervention by a Conservative member looking at some of the spending envelopes recently. He talked about something for a gender barracks in a Lebanese ski school. There was \$4 million for that. If Canadians looked at where the government is spending money, they would be 100% horrified.

I briefly talked about generational corruption, because rather than creating an even playing field and economic zones where the best companies get to put forward their ideas and compete to try to get through a streamlined environmental process, these guys decided the way to do it is to hand-pick projects. Lo and behold, who is getting some of this project money? It is Brookfield. How much more money is Brookfield going to get through backroom, insider deals with the Liberal government? I guess we are going to have wait and see, because that is what the Liberals have decided to do.

What is even scarier is that the CEO of Brookfield testified at committee and said that every time Brookfield does well, the Prime Minister does well financially because of his enormous shareholdings in Brookfield. What did the Liberals do? They set up a projects office where they hand-pick the projects. Can members imagine the backroom dealing that will go on to get those projects bumped up the list? The green slush fund is going to look like small potatoes at the end of what is happening with the special projects office, because the well-known insiders will know who to talk to and what to do to sneak their little projects up the list so that people get rich. Who is going to get rich? It is Liberal insiders.

This is one of the reasons we absolutely have to oppose this budget. It has generational debt, generational job losses and generational corruption. We are voting against this budget.

• (1215)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about investments, whether it is the national school food program, pharmacare, the dental program or the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been invested in Canadians through apprenticeship programs, there are many things where we have recognized that investing in Canadians is a good thing. The Conservatives, on the other hand, want to stand by and do nothing.

When they talk about deficits, it is important for them to recognize that the highest deficit was actually when the leader of the Conservative Party sat in caucus in 2009. They have no idea about deficits and how we can use deficit financing for the betterment of the country.

Does the member regret the fact that his leader, under Stephen Harper, had the highest deficit, in terms of the value of the Canadian dollar—

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, that is patently false. That is number one. Nothing approaches the deficit these guys ran in 2021 and 2022. Nothing approaches that.

The Liberals talk about things like dental care and the food program, and that is great. I am glad that the people who cannot afford dental can get some dental care and I am glad that some families that cannot afford to feed their children will get some food in a school food program, but the result of the Liberals' economic mismanagement and their economic vandalism is eight million visits to the food bank last year. Let us think about that. This is outrageous.

What they are doing with all of their spending is driving the vast majority of Canadians into food poverty, whereby they have to go to the food bank. They then create a couple of programs and try to pat themselves on the back. What they have to do is make food affordable for all Canadians, which is something they have failed miserably at.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on his speech. Obviously, I cannot agree with everything that was said. There is a reason we are not in the same political party.

The question I have for him has to do with the vitality of Quebec's media ecosystem, although I presume that similar issues are being felt elsewhere in Canada as well.

In the bill currently before us, the Liberal government is officially abolishing the digital services tax, which was supposed to help fund our struggling media. At the same time, rather than support private media, which is already struggling, the government has chosen once again to give money to the CBC to the tune of \$150 million in the latest budget.

Government Orders

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about the fact that the Liberals seem to believe that the CBC is the only media worth supporting. The other media outlets are being left to die.

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

[English]

The digital services tax is one of the most embarrassing debacles of the Liberal government, and it has had many. The Liberals were warned repeatedly that this was going to be a major trade irritant with the United States. When I travelled down to the United States as the shadow minister for international trade, I was repeatedly told by every congressman and senator I met with that the digital services tax was going to cause a huge problem in the relationship between Canada and the United States.

They went ahead anyway and imposed the digital services tax, which, of course, worsened the relationship between Canada and the United States. To make it worse, they just abandoned it for absolutely nothing in the negotiations with President Trump. It is really quite pathetic.

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a financial adviser, and he pointed out to me two of the best-performing stocks in the last year, especially since the Prime Minister took office. Number one is Dollarama. I think that speaks to the challenges Canadians are having. It had a 55% return. Number two is Brookfield, with a 54% return in the last year alone.

Could the member expand on the struggles Canadians are facing, which speaks to why a specific dollar store is doing so well? Secondly, why is Brookfield doing so well?

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I am not a stock expert, but stocks go up for a variety of reasons.

Dollarama is going up because Canadians are finding themselves squeezed. It is amazing how the Liberals never acknowledge it. They get up every day in the House of Commons and talk as though Canada is going through the biggest economic boom since post-World War II. They are so out of touch with reality. The reality is that Canadians cannot make ends meet, and they are going to the dollar store.

The other thing that sometimes drives stocks is speculation. People are speculating that Brookfield is going to get a lot more out of the Liberal government, because it has repeatedly in the last few months. There has been contract, contract, contract. It has been Brookfield, Brookfield, Brookfield.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise again in the House of Commons to represent the people of Peace River—Westlock. I thank them for putting me here again.

Government Orders

Today, we are debating the budget implementation act, Bill C-15. It is a monster of a bill. It has five major parts. Part 5 has 45 divisions. It is broad-ranging. It deals with removing the GST, getting rid of the carbon tax and getting rid of changes to housing infrastructure. It also has the piece I want to talk about first, which is big changes to the expropriation laws here in Canada. This is one of the things the Liberals tucked into the bill.

At the very end of the bill, there is something that the Liberals accuse us all the time of voting against, which is the school food program. That is the very last thing. The school food program is in division 44 of part 5. I am sure we will hear from the Liberals about how we voted against that. I just want to point out to everybody who is watching this back home that, indeed, that part is in the bill, but it is in division 44 of part 5 of this particular bill.

In division 1 of part 5 are the changes to the expropriation law. Members might be wondering why we have to change the laws around expropriation in this country. I do not know if people remember, but in the dying days of the Trudeau government, one of his last kicks at the can, so to speak, was an announcement of a high-speed rail line from Quebec City to Toronto. It is interesting to note that the majority of Canadians live in that corridor and that there is not a lot of public land in that corridor. Folks along that way would have their land expropriated in order to build this train line. We can imagine that folks would be concerned about how that is going to work. The bill lays out a bunch of the changes that would be made in order for the government to expropriate this land.

We do not have to look too far into the past to know about when the Liberals expropriated land for other vanity projects in the country. There was the Mirabel airport, for example. There is what is known today as the Rouge Park. These places were expropriated for grand visions the Liberal Party had, and neither has really come to fruition. We wonder in this case as well, while the government is taking on, perhaps, extraordinary powers in order to do these things, if we will ever see this project come to fruition.

Like many of the other things the government talks about, it is more than likely that it will do some of the harsh things it did in the past, such as with the Mirabel airport or Rouge Park, when it expropriated the land and ran over people's civil liberties, and, in the end, did not fulfill the project as was promised to Canadians. That is probably a very good analogy for many of the things the Liberal government has done. It generally talks a good game and it steals Conservative ideas, yet when it comes to implementation, it is scattershot and unfocused, and it basically stumbles from one crisis to another.

The other piece I want to talk about is another good Conservative idea. We had the idea to sell off public buildings and build housing, starting with the CBC headquarters. That would be after we shut it down. We would sell off the headquarters and put housing in there.

I did not know this, but apparently, we have an entire company, the Canada Lands Company, dedicated to selling off federal lands and managing some federal assets across the country. The company manages the Montréal Science Centre, the CN Tower and two other properties. It funds those operations by selling off other public lands the government wants to dispose off.

This was a program that we proposed in our platform. We were going to sell public lands and buildings. The Liberals have taken that idea.

● (1225)

What is very odd is that, I would suspect, selling lands and buildings would mean a net positive revenue for the government, yet the government is allocating \$1.5 billion to this corporation. The government said that, on the one hand, it is going to be selling off lands and buildings in order to increase housing and that, on the other hand, it is going to be funding the corporation \$1.5 billion.

I do not understand why that is the case, and there is no explanation in the bill as to why we need to allocate this much money. It just says that the government is going to allocate it in order to build more homes in this country. It is counterintuitive, and I do not understand. Hopefully the government can explain it to me later, in questions and comments. That piece of the bill seems very odd.

More broadly, and this is not specifically addressing Bill C-15 but more the budget in general, I mentioned earlier that the Liberals seem to just stumble from one crisis to another. There does not seem to be a clear direction. It feels as if each of the ministries is just off doing its own thing and in many cases is uncontrolled by its own minister. We probably see this no more alive than in the Algora Steel situation or the softwood lumber situation. Both of these situations have been around for a very long time.

The production of steel has happened for a very long time in Canada, yet there has been the layering on of regulations and challenges to our trade agreements around the world. Whether it is putting in new environmental standards, putting a carbon tax on our industries while all our competitor countries do not have a carbon tax, or taking them off coal when all the other countries we compete with use coal to produce steel, all these things cause death by a thousand cuts to these industries.

I had the privilege of touring the tube plant in Sault Ste. Marie a number of years ago. Sault Ste. Marie is incredibly proud of its industry. I do not know if members know this, but some of the steel made in Sault Ste. Marie goes to the tube plant to make oil field production pipe, and 95% of it is shipped to Grande Prairie, Alberta, so the connections between Sault Ste. Marie and northern Alberta are very tight.

This brings me to the other topic of softwood lumber. Softwood lumber is another one of the issues where the fact that the Liberals just keep stumbling along and failing to come to an agreement is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the problems facing our industries. Access to fibre is a major concern. Access to the ability to transport product on the railway is another major problem.

All these things take focus and require the government to ask how it can support the industry, particularly because this is a trade irritant with the United States. We should be working to make sure companies can remain profitable around the tariffs and to get a deal. The Prime Minister said that he would get a deal by July 21. If he did not think he could do that, he should not have made that promise. He should not have made that promise, but he did make it during the election.

I want to finish off my comments by talking about the standard of living in Canada. A decade ago, Canada was number five in the rankings for standard of living in the world. It was one of the happiest places in the world to live. Today we are 27th in the rankings of standard of living in the world. It has taken us a decade to plummet from number five to number 27 in standard of living. That is an indictment of the Liberals.

The Liberals will say over and over again that it has never been better, but even their own policies talk about how this is happening. The very fact that they are touting their school food program is an indictment of them, because Canadians are relying on food banks more than ever in order to feed themselves. This means our standard of living has gone down significantly.

• (1230)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on the member's last comment in regard to the national school food program. We have heard Conservatives say it is a "garbage" program. It is really quite unfortunate they have taken that kind of an approach. I have been around for a number of years as a parliamentarian. In the late 1980s, in the province of Manitoba, I can remember talking about children who were going to school on an empty stomach. We now have a national program to ensure that children can be learning after having had breakfast.

Does the member believe, as a number of his colleagues do, that it is a "garbage" program that does not have any value for the taxpayer?

Arnold Viersen: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that in the past the school food programs existed to fill an anomaly, a gap. They were not relied upon by the Canadian population in order to feed our children. Canadians had good-paying jobs in resource extraction industries that made the economy of this country function.

After a decade of the Liberals' being in power, programs are now coming forward as a solution to the problems they have made.

• (1235)

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government talks about all the things it thinks it is doing in the budget, and it asks where the waste is. In a budget with a more than \$78-billion deficit, what could possibly be wasteful?

I was doing some research. The government budgeted between \$4 million and \$8 million to build a rink at Rideau Hall. I have great news: I built a rink for my kids in my backyard this weekend. I could save the government \$8 million. I will grab a couple of buddies from Saskatchewan, we will get a box of fill and we will build a rink at Rideau Hall for under \$100.

Government Orders

Does the member think the government could find any other waste in the budget?

Arnold Viersen: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the government is wasting some money; there is no doubt about that. The Liberals' measure of success is how much money they spend. Whenever they have a solution, it is always just this: "Here is how much money we have spent."

I pointed out in my speech that \$1.5 billion is going to the Canada Lands Company, a corporation that is dedicated to selling off federal assets. I do not understand why a company that is dedicated to selling off assets needs to have a cash infusion of \$1.5 billion.

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, would my hon. colleague weigh in on what he is hearing from his constituents with respect to the size of this year's deficit of more than \$78 billion?

I believe the debt is now at over \$1.3 trillion. We are paying \$55 billion a year in interest on the national debt alone, more money than we are giving to the provinces and territories for health care transfers.

I am hearing this from my constituents on a daily basis. Is the member hearing similar comments from his constituents?

Arnold Viersen: Mr. Speaker, I am 100% hearing the same thing in northern Alberta. Life is getting unaffordable under the Liberals.

It is baffling to me that even after the Liberals cut the carbon tax, which was totally inflation-inducing, they brought in a massive deficit that is also going to continue to increase inflation, all the while driving our dollar value down, which also causes inflation.

Most of our food comes from around the world. We need to ensure that the trucks that bring it in are not subject to extra tax. We need to make sure our dollar is strong enough that we can afford things. The bananas we buy do not come from Canada; they come from somewhere else, and our dollar is buying them.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, does the member find any hypocrisy within the Conservative Party with respect to the Leader of the Conservative Party's having been in the Conservative caucus in 2009, when the Conservatives in fact had the highest deficit relative to the value of the dollar?

Does the member hear any hypocrisy in any of the speeches the Conservatives are delivering?

Arnold Viersen: Mr. Speaker, I outright reject the premise. Nonetheless, I would point out that I think the dollar value when Mr. Harper was in power hit \$1.13 American. This increased our buying power. It was a great time to live in Canada because we could afford to live.

Government Orders

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the recent Liberal budget, which actually came down late this year, on November 4, and about Bill C-15, the budget implementation act.

The Liberals promised to keep the deficit at roughly \$62 billion. They lost a finance minister last December over that number, and now it has escalated to \$78 billion. They promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio; instead it is up, and inflation is up. They promised to spend less, but they are spending \$90 billion more, which is \$5,400 more inflationary spending per family in this country.

We hear daily from colleagues across the floor about how they are creating programs to help struggling Canadians from coast to coast. Canadians, though, want well-paying jobs and financial security, not higher deficits and more taxes, and certainly not more handouts. Canadian workers and businesses are paying the price for the Liberal government's out-of-control spending.

In fact the Parliamentary Budget Officer, the PBO, told us that the Liberals' spending was unsustainable. This was backed up by the PBO's latest report, which found that the government even broke past Trudeau's fiscal guardrails when the deficit increased to \$68.5 billion. It is an additional \$20 billion or so in spending that has not even been included in the outlook of the Liberal platform. It is unsustainable; there is no question about it.

Those of us who manage a family budget know exactly those numbers and what they mean. The government is simply maxing out the credit card for future generations to pay off with interest. This costly credit card budget is gambling away this country's future. It means that Canadians will now be spending more money on servicing the debt than we spend on health care in each province and territory in this country.

The debt is so large that it eclipses the spending on major government initiatives. At least 10¢ of every dollar sent to Ottawa is now spent servicing the out-of-control debt by the Liberal government. Interest payments will reach \$54 billion, which is 10.8% of total federal revenues.

Conservatives have presented amendments to boost take-home pay and deliver affordable homes and food by ending the hidden taxes, to cut wasteful spending, to open our country up to opportunity, and, for heaven's sake, to get rid of the bureaucracy in order to build affordable homes. We call on the Prime Minister to work with us on this side of the House to support a positive, hopeful and affordable future for all Canadians.

We know that Canadians are hard-working and very generous. They deserve better than the government has produced. Today is national day of giving in this country. I do not know if members knew this, but it was created in 2012. It is a simple idea: a day that encourages people in this country to do good things in their communities.

I remember working at a radio station in Saskatoon when the morning man, Denny Carr, started a program in our city called Secret Santa Campaign. That was way back in 1983. Denny had a vision of ensuring that all Saskatoon children would receive a new toy at Christmas. People stopped by our station with unwrapped

toys every week in advance of Christmas. Then Saskatoon City Hall got involved; it had an area set aside dedicated for people to drop off unwrapped toys. Then the Saskatoon Fire Department, whose members are here today in Ottawa, would go around our community singing Christmas carols, just to get people into the spirit.

● (1240)

Yesterday, people gathered in my city at the traditional wieners and beans lunch to kick off the Secret Santa Campaign. I have to thank Rachael Steinke and her staff at the Saskatoon Community Foundation for a part of this tradition. I remember Denny starting this in 1983. Yesterday's event marked the 41st year of Secret Santa. Thousands of people in our community have given their time and donations, in memory of Denny Carr, to his Secret Santa Campaign. Today, in my city, over 100,000 children and 55,000 families in need have been assisted with toys, books and food hampers.

I should add that, in 1999, Denny Carr was honoured with Canada's highest honour, the Order of Canada. Denny's belief was that one person could make a difference.

Saskatoon has always punched above its weight when it comes to philanthropy. In 1997, a Saskatoon Progress Club member by the name of Ted Merriman, along with then B'nai Brith president Sid Katzman, started a care and share program to feed inner-city school students. I want to thank executive director Sandi Meldru, who organized this event. They have over 20 schools that they visit in the month of December. They partner with various businesses in Saskatoon, serving up a turkey Christmas meal with all the fixings. Staff members from each of the donating businesses also come out to dish out the food and clean up after the event, so the education staff can also enjoy a sit-down meal with the kids they teach.

When I was a member of the board of education in Saskatoon as a trustee, it was always a highlight to volunteer at these schools over the lunch hour. They are supporting Christmas now in my city and others, but supporting Christmas in my city started with Saskatoon's the Star Phoenix newspaper, which gives much-needed funds to the Salvation Army's Christmas hamper program. Every week the Star Phoenix newspaper names people who have donated money. They are recognized in the newspaper.

What a wonderful way to remember our loved ones, of whom many have given us enjoyment on our ball diamonds, ice facilities, football fields and other sport facilities. It is just a wonderful idea by Kevin Mitchell and I thank Saskatoon's The Star Phoenix for continuing this tradition.

I salute Rawlco Radio, which has a campaign to adopt a family and is also helping out the Salvation Army. That was started in 1988. Through its hamper program, families receive food and grocery gift cards to ensure that no child will go without a Christmas meal. I thank Derek and Angela Kerr from the Salvation Army and their dedicated team.

Government Orders

I should mention also the kettle campaign, for which many volunteer in every community in this country. They stand there, ring the bell and hopefully get some donations.

The YMCA Saskatoon is raising funds all this month for its summer camps and child care spaces. The YMCA is the largest provider of child care in our city. We thank Tina and Jerry Grandey for matching donations this month of up to \$40,000.

I should mention our food bank, which has been taking donations at a very busy time, and Laurie O'Connor, the executive director. There have been 23,000 visits now per month in Saskatoon. That is a record demand in a province that is known for feeding the world with our agriculture community.

I want to give a shout-out to the Ahmadiyya Muslim Youth Association. I joined them two weeks ago on a food bank drive in my riding in Rosewood. We went door to door collecting donations for the food bank. The need is great in our community. Donations for the Friendship Inn are coming in as well. It is open 365 days a year and serves over 500,000 meals. The campaign is called, "Hunger is happening. Fill the Plate".

The Blades will hold a teddy bear toss night. Fans are asked to bring a plush toy and throw it onto the ice when the team scores. Those teddies will then be collected and brought to the Jim Pattison Children's Hospital.

Canadians are generous. The government needs to back off and let Canadians do the work.

• (1245)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that Canadians are generous. They very much have a caring attitude filled with love. We see a lot of that demonstrated in the month of December, and even beyond December. It is appropriate to thank all the volunteers and organizations that do fantastic work in providing wonderful meals at Christmas and, at times, throughout the year. I appreciate the member's speech in that respect.

Would the member not agree that maybe we should pass legislation, in the Christmas spirit, such as that on bail reform, which Canadians want to see?

• (1250)

Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, it is Giving Tuesday. Let us think about this from coast to coast. Those who have access to extra money give back to each and every community. That is what makes our communities. I know better what is happening in my community than the government does. Each of us, when we go back home, has a pretty good idea of what is happening because we go to events and listen to people.

This is a way to get government out of the way. Once government and its bureaucracy are out of the way, then we can make a real difference in our communities.

Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member comes from a generous community, and we can hear in his voice how much he loves the community he represents.

How does he feel when he hears that \$150 million would be going to Eurovision, which is a complete waste when people are starving and will not have Christmas presents under their trees? What are his thoughts, and how does he feel about that?

Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, it is not only that \$150 million. How about the \$150 million the government is giving to the public CBC network for no reason whatsoever? Private institutions in this country are struggling, yet \$1.4 billion is going to the CBC. It is part of Google now and gets a portion of that, and the Prime Minister decided during the campaign that was not enough and that the government was going to give another \$150 million to the CBC. It is better spent in our communities.

Canadians are standing up today, because it is Giving Tuesday, to make the decisions in their communities that they know are best.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for showcasing the giving spirit in Saskatoon and how, if the government got out of the way, lots of private companies and benefactors would fill the void and help the less fortunate in our society.

With all the money the Liberal government is spending and giving to their friends, insiders, Brookfield, bondholders and bankers, does the member believe it cut \$98 million from the RCMP in this budget go-round?

Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina—Lewvan and I love the depot in Regina. The government has talked about moving that depot out of Saskatchewan to Quebec. There is enough nonsense about this. We have worked hard for the RCMP museum to get responsible funding so it can combine the indigenous story along with the story of the RCMP.

In our province now, we have started a marshal program because the numbers are down on members of the RCMP. The Liberals have not done any recruiting whatsoever. They talk a good game, saying they are going to this or that and have border security, but where are the numbers? The number of members are down at the RCMP depot and at border security. The government talks a good game, but it does little.

Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we get into the details of the budget implementation act, it is important to take a step back to assess the philosophy that has informed the budget itself. The big picture of the budget rests on a single question: Is the government a player or a referee in the arena we know as Canada? Of course, this arena is not hosting a game of hockey or soccer. This is a game of factions. This is a game of competing private interests.

Government Orders

The government, as a referee, would take no sides. The referee gets out of the way. He draws the lines of the arena, and lays down the rules that allow the best players and teams to win. This is the North Star of the Conservative world view. Unfortunately, the red Liberal government sees itself as a player. It is picking winners and losers through that age-old enemy of human progress, central planning interventionism.

As the Liberals see themselves as a player, they have always stacked the game in their favour. They are team asset inflation. They are team rentier economy. They are team feudalism. The Liberals do not believe in a productive economy that works for hard-working Canadians. One of the chief ways team feudalism has empowered its rentier economy with unending asset inflation is through immigration. The immigration file has been noticeably absent from the debate on the budget and its implementation, so I will ask members to please allow me to give it some floor time.

Affordability for Canadians is a core Conservative focus. As a member of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, I have learned over the past several months how the immigration file is deeply affecting housing, health care and employment for everyday Canadians. The Liberals admit, on page 95 of the budget, that, “the pace of arrivals began to exceed Canada’s capacity to absorb and support newcomers”. On the same page, the Liberals further admit, “In 2018, 3.3 per cent of Canada’s population were temporary residents. By 2024, that number had more than doubled to 7.5 per cent, an unprecedented rate of growth that put pressure on housing supply [and] the healthcare system”.

These expressions in percentages do not do the raw numbers justice. Let me take one of the most devastating years on record, that is 2023, and repeat the figures. We issued over 681,000 study permits to international students, 761,000 work permits through the international mobility program and over 183,000 work permits through the temporary foreign worker program.

I grant there is some overlap between these categories, as a single person can be counted under two categories. Nonetheless, we are in a situation where our economy has been flooded with at least an extra million foreigners in any given year. The rapid growth of temporary residents overall in 2022 and 2023 contributed to Canada having the highest annual population growth rate since 1957. These figures are madness when we realize that only 30 years ago, we used to admit around 30,000 international students per year.

Team feudalism across the aisle knows what game it is playing. Just as it engages in deficit spending to map more units of currency to a stagnant suite of goods and services, team feudalism has flooded an increasing number of people into Canada against a roughly steady state housing and jobs situation. What does team feudalism produce in both situations? It produces its time-honoured goal of asset inflation under a rentier model.

• (1255)

The Liberals have used both the temporary foreign worker program and the international mobility program as a business model to keep wages artificially low, to keep paper profits high and to price Canadians out of the job market. The interventionist red Liberals pick their winners, and they have chosen to give a discretionary

government subsidy to unproductive rentier businesses that can only function on the modern equivalent of slave labour.

I wish this were the end of my immigration critique, but there is another unfortunate layer. I do not know whether this is a tragedy or a comedy. We know, for instance, that nearly 50,000 holders of foreign student visas were not studying at any Canadian university or college, but rather working and attempting to settle here. This finding is confusing unless we realize that we have not been matching our international student intake to our labour market needs.

The main field of choice for international students has been business studies and, at the college level, nearly 50% of all international students are enrolled in business programs. In the 2022-23 academic year, there were over 90,000 international students enrolled in college business programs and close to 60,000 international students in university business programs. This is not the labour force we need to build Canada strong. A promise was made to many of these students that this would put them on the immigration track in Canada, when the simple fact was that there were not enough permanent resident slots to accommodate the huge volume of students we let into the country.

What conclusion are we now led to? Team feudalism used international students not as a value added to our skills mix, but as a form of quantitative easing to inflate the assets of its rentier economy. It just needed more bodies in the country to boost up rent and housing prices, while suppressing the wages of hard-working Canadians. The Liberals do not represent team Canada. They do not represent the average hard-working Canadian. They represent the most ancient of feudalisms with a fake paper economy bolstered by something that very nearly approximates a slave system.

While over two million Canadians visit food banks each month and 700,000 of those are kids, the Liberals work every day to inflate asset prices, whether through deficit spending or by letting any warm body pass into the country to keep those rents sky-high. Team feudalism has the audacity to run a \$78-billion deficit with over \$90 billion in new spending, which equates to over \$5,000 per Canadian household, yet still says they wish to build Canada strong.

Government Orders

The question is, strong for whom? The Liberals have not been playing as a referee in the great game of factions. They have chosen to play for team asset inflation and they have made us all poorer for this decision. Young Canadians cannot get the jobs they need, the housing they deserve or the health care services they are entitled to. With money printers working overdrive, what future does Canada have under the Liberal feudal regime? I do not see a future here, and it worries me.

• (1300)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just to pick up on the immigration comments, I wonder if the member is aware that the leader of the Conservative Party today was a part of the Harper team that, back in January 2014, proposed and put into place a system that would see 450,000 international researchers and students come to Canada on an annual basis by 2022. Does the member believe that the Harper regime and his current leader were wrong in increasing the numbers to the degree that they proposed? Remember, following 2021, we had the pandemic coming up.

Was the member's leader wrong?

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Liberal government that it had 10 years to fix any such problem. It had 10 years to address it. Look where we are today. As I said in my speech, the numbers I provided show that it has actually gotten worse. Let us not go back through history to see who did what when. We are talking about how the current Liberal government is unable to resolve this problem to make Canada strong and make Canada better.

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are so happy to have the hon. member for Markham—Unionville on our team.

I recently spoke to Carole from the Seniors Tin Cup and she quoted these numbers. She said that the poverty line in Canada is \$25,252, and that 28% of senior women are living in poverty through no fault of their own. The government has nothing in the budget for seniors. Single seniors are struggling every single day.

What comments do you have to give to the government, which does not respect the people who built this country?

• (1305)

The Deputy Speaker: Before I recognize the member, questions should be addressed through the Chair.

I have no comments, but I invite the member for Markham—Unionville to share his.

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, with this budget, we are not helping Canadians who have contributed to the Canadian economy and to building Canada strong throughout their lifetimes in Canada. We are not taking care of them when they need it now. It is shameful that a lot of seniors have to line up at food banks and so forth. We need to do more for seniors who helped bring this country to this point. We need to enable them to live gracefully.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, with regard to seniors, his leader was part of a former government that gave nothing in terms of increases. Contrast that to how we gave the largest in-

crease to seniors on GIS and a 10% substantial increase to OAS for seniors, 75 years and older. As well, those programs have been getting annual increases based on inflation.

If we just talk about those social programs alone, which are all encapsulated in the budget to support seniors, does the member not believe this is what we should be doing and vote in favour of these types of programs?

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that, as I said, there are more seniors lining up at food banks than in previous years. That means whatever the Liberal government is doing it is not enough to address the challenges our seniors are facing.

After the pandemic, inflation and food costs rose significantly, yet the government has not really addressed that inflation to help our seniors live with grace.

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in this place on behalf of the residents of Portage—Lisgar, those who proudly call south central Manitoba home.

I would like to start today with a glaring example of Liberal incompetence buried in the budget implementation act. The government is sheepishly backtracking on its so-called anti-greenwashing rules in the Competition Act, rules that it rammed through the House just last year in Bill C-59. Do members remember those?

In their ideological zeal to police every environmental claim, the Liberals demanded businesses back up statements with “internationally recognized methodology”, imposing rigid tests that invited frivolous lawsuits. What happened? Reality happened, and it hit hard.

The Canada Pension Plan Investment Board rolled back its own net-zero portfolio commitment, with experts linking it to these changes. The Royal Bank of Canada ditched its \$500-billion sustainable finance pledge and stopped disclosing key green metrics, fearing penalties. The rules created a chilling effect as businesses halted legitimate green claims to avoid the red tape nightmare. Even the Competition Bureau's guidelines could not save this mess, as industry feedback poured in about the unworkable burden.

Now the Liberals are quietly relaxing it to “adequate and proper substantiation” and banning private lawsuits, admitting their overreach without any apology. We were yet again handed another policy straight from the activist ivory tower, which was so divorced from real-world consequences that it is quietly getting tossed in this bill.

Government Orders

The worst part is that these are not harmless daydreams. Every time government chases one of these activist-crafted fantasies, real people are the ones paying the price. While the activists congratulate themselves for a job well done, Canadians are left to deal with higher costs, fewer choices and a government that seems allergic to anything resembling common sense.

Personally, as a strong proponent of getting big projects built in this country, a place where it unfortunately has become next to impossible to get anything done, I am quite upset there were no changes in this legislation to the broken impact assessment process the Liberals created in the first place. Instead of fixing their mess, the Liberals have created a new bureaucracy with the Major Projects Office. It is still too early to tell if this office will succeed in any way, and so far it has only announced projects that basically have already been approved or are already under construction. Out of those 11 projects, the office thinks only two will be deemed projects in the national interest.

At its core, what this office is doing is providing a “concierge” service for the cherry-picked projects the Prime Minister has decided to move forward on. The mere fact that the Liberals need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to hire countless new bureaucrats and probably a bunch of consultants to shepherd projects through this maze of regulations is indicative of how bad things have become in this country.

Make no mistake: The government is picking winners and losers. Whoever has the best lobbyists or friends in the PMO can get their project referred to the Major Projects Office and get it sent to the front of the line. It is basically the Air Canada super elite program, where a select few stroll down the red carpet, breeze through their own priority security line and sail past check-in, while everyone else gets bumped, stranded on the terminal floor and stuck on hold for hours hoping somebody, anybody, just picks up. This is because the Liberals have made it so impossible to get projects built.

If we step back for a second, we will quickly see that hundreds of billions of dollars or over half a trillion dollars of investment has fled the country over the past 10 years. The outflow of capital is simply remarkable and sad. We saw how the Liberals' ill-thought-out emissions cap, which was very much a production cap, was abandoned. We saw their ludicrous EV mandate get put on ice to buy them some time to figure out how to get themselves out of that mess. We have seen ideology trump reality time and time again.

Now we see a Liberal caucus that seems to be ripping apart at the seams as its members struggle to reorient themselves. I will admit that it has been something to watch former Liberal environment ministers get a little hot and bothered as their once-sacred flagship policies are quietly tossed overboard. To be fair, the one who just resigned at least had the decency to walk away from the chauffeured car and the extra salary instead of twisting himself into a pretzel trying to defend all the recent backflips.

Just yesterday, I asked the new Minister of Environment a straightforward question. I asked her if they have given up on meeting their emissions reduction target. Her answer was pure bureaucratic gibberish that was so tangled that members would need a map and compass to navigate their way out of it. She could not bring herself to say what everybody already knows: After a decade

of failed policies, they are nowhere near hitting these targets. It has been all pain for no gain.

• (1310)

Members do not have to take my word for it. The environment commissioner himself said that the Liberals now boast the worst record in the entire G7. Just as the Liberals have chased away hundreds of billions of dollars in investment, and nickelled and dimed families for heating their homes and filling up their cars, their policies still fail spectacularly.

Now, the new minister tells us that they will unveil new measures to meet the targets sometime next month. Forgive me for not popping the champagne on this one. We have all seen this movie before, and the sequel is never better than the original. Chances are that this will be yet another round of environmental policies destined for the same shelf, where all their other failures go to die. Let us be honest. When a government this far behind suddenly insists it is still on track, what it is really signalling is a whole heap of new regulations and taxes so heavy-handed that they could bring our economy to a halt.

We know about one of the ideas the Liberals support: the UN's new net-zero carbon tax on shipping. The Liberal Minister of the Environment insisted just yesterday that imposing this UN-backed net-zero shipping tax, potentially hitting \$500 per tonne, will not drive up the cost of everyday items for Canadians. Think about that in a Canadian context, where we were not even at \$100 per tonne. I live in the real world where businesses do not just eat these taxes out of the goodness of their hearts. They pass them straight down to every Canadian.

If I were expected to take the minister at her word that the Liberals have not abandoned their 2030 targets, whatever else they are cooking up must be an absolute doozy because, my goodness, they have a lot of ground to make up. I ask this not rhetorically but earnestly: What is the point of having a Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act when absolutely no minister, department or government will ever be held accountable for any of their failures?

To move on from the environmental failures of this government, equally important is what has been excluded from this legislation. Fortunately, the Liberal government decided not to proceed with its disastrous idea to strip faith-based organizations of their charitable status. That this idea was even proposed is extremely concerning. I have had hundreds of my constituents write to me and agree with the idea that the government should never be stripping faith-based organizations of their charitable status. These charities support the most vulnerable in our society, filling a crucial gap the state simply cannot. The economic benefit is clear. Cardus Institute research shows that, for every dollar a congregation spends, the local community receives \$3.39 in economic benefit. Why even raise the prospect of revoking their charitable status? It is clearly not for fiscal reasons.

The best explanation seems to be that the Liberals want to divide Canadians for political gain. This has become an extremely common trend under this government, and it is happening in real time. Just this week, we learned the Liberals have secured the Bloc's support for their proposed combatting hate act, which is yet another attempt to police the thoughts of Canadians. What is the deal they struck in making amendments to criminalize sections of sacred texts? This is completely unnecessary. The government already has the tools it needs to prosecute those who promote violence and genocide. Adding insult to injury, the same member who proposed policing biblical verses was just now made the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture.

I say this to my Liberal colleagues: Stop attacking our inheritance from our ancestors for their political gain. Canadians are tired of it. Whether it be the Liberals' tacit support of tearing down statues and belittling symbols of national importance or the general pursuit of shaming our heritage, Canadians do not want a government that wages war on their values, their faith and their heritage. They want a government that supports the vulnerable, respects the contributions of charities and unites Canadians rather than dividing them. They want a responsible government that acts with common sense. They are not getting it with the Liberal government. Canadians deserve better.

• (1315)

Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was greatly encouraged to hear the member refer to the need for us to maintain robust and effective climate and environmental policies in this country. I could not agree more. I think it is fair to say that many Canadians, at least for the last 35 years or so, have not associated the Conservative Party with a strong environmental record, although there is a rich lineage of Conservative environmental policy going back before that.

Could the member share with the House what his party supports in terms of measures to support a clean environment, reduce our emissions and improve the health of Canadians?

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, let us look at the root word in "Conservative": "conserve". We are conservationists at our core. What we believe in is taking care of our natural landscapes. People in polling consistently care about clean air, clean water and protecting our natural landscapes. I represent a whole bunch of people who live, work and play on the land. They are the best conservationists and the true environmentalists, and I will always fight back

Government Orders

against some concrete-jungle, ivory-tower policy idea trying to be imposed on the people I represent. As it turns out, as evidenced by the environment commissioner's own report, these are not working.

The Liberal government's policies have been an abysmal failure. They have been all pain and absolutely no gain.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance was bragging about investing \$115 billion over five years in his budget. However, if we take a close look at the numbers, we realize that, in fact, there will be only \$9 billion in new funding over five years for all of the provinces from coast to coast to coast, including \$5 billion earmarked to build hospitals and clinics. That means that the 10 provinces and three territories will receive \$4 billion over five years for infrastructure.

I would like to know whether my colleague thinks that is enough or whether he supports the provinces' request to invest \$100 billion over 10 years. I would also like him to tell me why he thinks there is such a big discrepancy between the Department of Finance's made-up numbers and the reality on the ground.

[*English*]

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, a nearly \$80-billion deficit is most definitely enough. I also have real questions about where the government is spending its money because, clearly, it is not reaching the people it needs to.

I am a firm believer in investing in local infrastructure. In my rural communities, we have much aging infrastructure in need of renewal. Too often, though, as with everything else from the Liberal government, the Liberals decide to pick winners and losers. It is often the forgotten rural communities, which people like me and many other colleagues across and on this side of the aisle represent, that get so frustrated when the government decides to put crazy ideas as strings attached to any sort of funding.

At the end of the day, we need to let our local governments decide how best to spend the money. The federal government needs to get out of the way and let local communities decide.

• (1320)

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to respond to this: The government has indicated it is going to increase spending in national defence and give us the armed forces we should have.

Government Orders

However, at the very same time, it is cutting in every department. In this moment, those of us studying suicide in veterans' lives have found out they are stressed to the nth degree because they thought this is where the Liberals were going. Sure enough, our veterans are facing the largest cut: \$4 billion, which is more than every other department.

Do you see this as a good method of increasing recruiting?

The Deputy Speaker: Before I recognize the member for Portage—Lisgar, a member cannot speak to another member directly by using “you” but goes through the Chair. The Chair has no views.

I invite the member for Portage—Lisgar to comment.

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of conversations recently with some folks back home. We have a helicopter training facility there, as well as some veterans. Folks have said that the top-up on salary is appreciated, but their concern is about the cuts and what impact those could have on veterans' services.

Again, the idea of investing in our military is a very sound one, but there are structural, fundamental issues in the way we go about procuring things in this government and in this country, particularly when it comes to our armed forces. We need to be very mindful, not only of finding ways to improve outcomes, but also, in every way and every day, supporting and thanking those who served in uniform to protect our country.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to stand and give my perspective on why I personally, and a number of my colleagues, voted against the budget. The Prime Minister advised Justin Trudeau and his ongoing Liberal government to construct and keep the roadblocks and red tape that have decimated Canada's ability to compete for investment. As an example, Nutrien's recent announcement is a huge blow to Saskatchewan's export of the best potash in the world. My Prince Albert colleague summed it up: “Nutrien didn't pick the U.S. because they wanted to. They picked the U.S. because Canada made it too slow...too expensive...and too unpredictable to build here. The U.S. made it easy. That's the whole story.”

Canada's west coast has structural bottlenecks. Vancouver's north shore depends on one rail bridge, a major choke point. Longview already has ready rail, a redeveloped berth and immediate expansion capacity. Nutrien ran 30 criteria. It compared rail rates, freight costs, construction costs and regulatory risk. Longview, Washington, outperformed every Canadian port.

Canada's permitting system kills projects. B.C. port approval takes 5 years to 10 years with open-ended requirements. In the U.S., the process runs on fixed timelines and is measured in months. Transportation now costs more than mining. Industry analysis shows shipping is the largest cost in potash.

Nutrien built where logistics are cheaper and faster, and that is not in Canada. Labour, carbon policy and regulation all push investment south. The U.S. offers predictable labour, lower build costs and no \$170 per tonne industrial carbon tax. Investors follow certainty, and Canada does not offer it under the current government. Governments reacted after the decision; Ottawa and B.C. said they were disappointed after Nutrien picked Longview, while

Saskatchewan reminded everyone that this is the second potash terminal lost since 2016, because B.C.'s system is too slow and the government has not been acting.

The bottom line is that Nutrien did not abandon Canada. Liberal policies pushed the investment out, and the U.S. simply opened the door. If we cannot even secure a port for the resources we dominate globally, what else are we going to lose?

Bill C-5 gives full exception to these regulations for nation-building projects only, so the Prime Minister has no excuse for not getting a pipeline built from Alberta to the B.C. northwest coast, even while these same laws still cause other potential private investment and nation-building opportunities to remain out of reach as U.S. tariffs continue to cause job losses. Algoma Steel is an example, with 1,000 workers this week. However, the PM has made it clear he will not do his job to squelch the option of a veto, and thus signals failure to potential proponents wanting to build a pipeline.

The Prime Minister also continued to green-light immigration, compounding the shortage in affordable homes, access to health care, and jobs for immigrants who came to Canada the right way to work hard to become productive citizens, and especially for young Canadians who are told they will never have the opportunity to own their own home or save for their own future.

A minimal tax cut for 20 million Canadians does not begin to offset the impact of inflation on the higher cost of essentials, let alone the interest payments on our debt. Canadian families will be out \$5,000 in the trade-off this year. This minuscule tax cut gives the government a misleading talking point that only puts a pinky band-aid on a huge wound, the wound of the loss of purchasing power and the burden of more hidden taxes the government tells Canadians to believe are only in their heads, such as the industrial carbon tax, the 17¢ per litre fuel standard tax, the \$1-billion food packaging tax and the inflation tax created by too much imaginary money with too few goods to buy.

Government Orders

The budget fails to cut taxes on work, homebuilding, investment and energy, by not reducing personal income tax for low-income workers, not incentivizing investment in Canada by reducing the capital gains tax and not cutting homebuilding taxes, such as permits and GST, on all new home builds. It fails to stop the inflation tax by unlocking more resource development and revenue. The government should be cutting wasteful spending on bureaucracy, consultants, corporate welfare, foreign aid and false refugee claimants.

Programs that fall short for the people who were assured assistance are temporary, piecemeal handouts from a government that should be unleashing our economy and restoring affordability rather than growing the number of Canadians who cannot afford basic essentials. It is choosing to give these supports, as it calls them, which are simply stopgaps that do not provide long term independence and prosperity for Canadians.

• (1325)

Over and over again the government says it is investing in Canadians, when what it is doing is creating the issues that are making their lives very difficult and then providing interim emergency supports that do not bring the wealth to this country that Canadians need and want in order to be self-sufficient. The Liberal government has created the very crisis circumstances that it is falsely claiming it is fixing.

The Canadian Dental Association had its Days on the Hill this past week and exposed some issues with the Canadian dental care program that are causing confusion and disappointment for patients and doctors, including misleading deadlines. One lady, an elderly senior, got dentures. They were supposed to be 100% covered. She renewed the program at the beginning of the month and still had 30 days to make a claim, but because she renewed when it said to, the amount she was reimbursed was only \$40. What happens then?

The government made unexpected adjustments to the awards and is denying certain claims without transparency. Dentists are carrying outstanding billings for the people who cannot afford to pay up front what they thought they would have covered. There are nine million Canadians enrolled in the program, and they are finding out the hard way that there are issues with it.

The federal government should get out of the way of investment and ensure, and this is really important, that Canadian workers build national infrastructure projects directly, without Brookfield and other players' getting subsidies from our tax dollars to hire Canadians in our own country. Talk about fleecing Canadian taxpayers.

Duff Conacher from Democracy Watch warned that our Prime Minister could personally profit from massive federal infrastructure spending tied to his substantial investments, including but not limited to Brookfield. This is something that causes me to look at the government and say that there is no way it should have the privilege to bring forward any budgets in the future that cause this kind of self-sufficiency for people who are making money at the expense of Canadians.

We know that there are 1,900 Brookfield assets that the Prime Minister did not submit to his ethics screen. There are many, but

here are at least three major Liberal projects in Canada's 2025 budget involving Brookfield. The Build Canada Homes initiative ties \$36 billion to Brookfield for modular housing. This is housing that the PM foreshadowed on April 8, 2025, over seven months ago, as the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, saying, "Prefabricated and modular housing are the [way of the] future."

A 19-year-old first-time voter shared with me that he and his friends were excited to vote for the leader of the official opposition to become the next prime minister. Later, texting with his friends, he told me that they were changing their minds. I asked him to ask them why. They said that during the election campaign, the Prime Minister told young Canadians to their face that the Liberals would build homes they can afford.

I told him to explain to his friends that this is called an open-ended sentence, which lets them finish the thought with what they think it is defining. I asked him to ask them whether what they heard was that the government will build homes they can afford to rent, or homes they can afford to buy. Eyes grew wide, and brows furrowed. They thought he was going to fix things so they could afford to buy a home. Who is going to have the investment in their homes? Will it be young Canadians or Brookfield and the Prime Minister?

Brookfield has many interests and contracts in Liberal nation-building projects, generating billions in stock profit. This arrangement is about conflict of interest, especially given the PM's significant financial holdings in Brookfield. Canadians deserve to know all the details of how the Prime Minister is using his office to put Brookfield and personal profits ahead of Canadians' trust. The premise of this budget is to limit Canadians' options for their futures, while he and his friends continue to profit while bleeding our country dry.

• (1330)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand the scene: personal attacks, character assassination and misinformation.

It is interesting. The member posed the previous question, with regard to veterans. The Conservatives try to give the impression that the government is cutting back \$4 billion. What they do not tell us is that this is \$4 billion in savings, because we used to pay \$8 a gram for medical marijuana but it is now being reduced to \$6 a gram. Only the Conservatives would argue that we should continue to pay more than what the market is providing for.

Government Orders

That is where the \$4 billion is, but the Conservatives try to give the impression that we are cutting back on veterans. The Conservatives know this is not true. A real cut was when their leader cut and closed nine Veterans Affairs offices across Canada.

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly send over an article that describes exactly where that \$4 billion is being cut. A portion of it is in regard to cannabis, but I guarantee that it is far from accounting for the total amount of \$4 billion.

Let us talk about the offices that were closed. They were closed on the recommendation of the bureaucrats, who said that they were not being used extensively. Did we shut down the services? No. They were moved to other places. In Regina, in my riding, services were moved to the service centre in one of the malls. When they were moved back downtown, veterans had to go up four floors in a building where there was bulletproof glass and where it was hard to park. They said to me, “Why did they do that, Cathay? We loved going to the mall where we could get our mail, have coffee, get our groceries and go to Veterans Affairs.”

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the budget, the Liberals talked about investment in the future. There is an operating budget and an investment budget. The PBO, whom the Liberals do not like, said that \$90 billion of the investment budget should actually be in the operating budget. The deficit is actually skyrocketing past \$78 billion to \$90 billion. The PBO said that.

What does my colleague think about the misinformation coming from the Liberals about what investment actually looks like, when that \$90 billion should be in the operating budget and not in the investment budget?

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the government does not care about telling Canadians about the true state of our democracy and about the true state of our economy.

In addition to that, it appears that the Liberals are very intentional in misleading Canadians. That is why we need to remove the current government, so that Canadians can have a prime minister who truly is a servant of the people.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, let us do another fact check. Earlier a member of the Conservative Party indicated that he had heard the government was going to be closing down the RCMP Depot. I have heard nothing of that nature. I am wondering if the member would be able to provide any evidence whatsoever that the Conservative Party has that says the RCMP Depot in Regina will be closing down.

• (1335)

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, definitely that was something that was being mused about.

Whenever Canadians get upset, and I must say that in my province they have expressed themselves well throughout the whole decade I have been here, the Liberal government tries to drop little things in as a possibility but then has to reverse its stance, as with Remembrance Day wreaths and with chaplains' being able to pray at Legion Remembrance Day services.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question will be short and simple. My colleague talked a lot about

Brookfield. How is it ethically dangerous and concerning for a prime minister to put his personal interests ahead of the interests of his fellow Canadians?

[*English*]

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of the problem I have been pretty much entirely focused on in my concerns around this budget. When we have a Prime Minister who blatantly puts his money in offshore accounts and who blatantly refuses to admit that there are 1,900 different organizations that he is profiting from, we know that the Prime Minister does not have the best interests of Canadians at heart.

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-15, the budget implementation act, and to give a voice to Brampton West residents and all Canadians who feel that the government has forgotten them. Families are falling behind, seniors are struggling and young Canadians' dreams of owning a home have been stolen by Liberal mismanagement.

The Liberal government is now in its 10th year of driving our country deeper into debt and deeper into a housing crisis and an affordability crisis not seen in generations. Bill C-15, the first implementation act of the 2025 budget, would do nothing to change course; it is more spending, taxes and bureaucracy, and fewer results. The budget does not put Canadians first; it puts consultants, insiders and Brookfield first, everyone except Canadian families.

In Brampton West and in Peel, I see the impacts every day. Young families in my communities are stretched to the limit, housing costs are crushing and rents keep going up. Many people in Peel who once dreamed of home ownership now tell me the dream feels out of reach or too expensive to risk. Wages are not keeping pace; food bank use is at an all-time high; crime, extortion and shootings are all rising; small businesses are suffocated by taxes and red tape; and young people are losing hope.

Businesses in Brampton, especially small ones, are under pressure. They do not need more regulation or government programs; they need stability and certainty in order to invest, hire and grow. The budget does absolutely nothing to fix it. It is not a growth plan; it is a trap for our future, especially for young Canadians. Brampton residents deserve a government that works for them, not against them.

Government Orders

The budget is built on the same fantasy that has guided the Liberals since 2015: the belief that they can spend endlessly without consequences, but Canadians know the consequences all too well. The Liberals promised to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio; they raised it. They promised to spend less; they added another \$90 billion, which will cost every family \$5,400. The Prime Minister is running a \$78.3-billion deficit, not to build homes, lower costs and help families but to cover up nine years of economic failure. It is not a budget; it is a warning, a flashing red light on the dashboard of the Canadian economy.

Canada's national debt is now over \$1.3 trillion. Debt servicing costs are higher than the federal government's total health transfers to the provinces; we pay more to service the debt than we spend on the health care Canadians rely on. Debt servicing in 2025-26 will reach \$55.6 billion, which is more than the Canada health transfer. This is fiscal negligence, economic recklessness and generational theft.

Who pays for it? It is not the ministers who make the decisions or the bureaucrats who add the lines. The next generation pays for it: students, young families and workers in Brampton and right across the country. That is the Liberal legacy, and Bill C-15 would cement it.

I represent Brampton West, a young and diverse community full of hard-working families, seniors, new Canadians and small businesses. These residents are not asking for handouts; they are asking for fairness, stability and a chance to get ahead. However, today mortgage renewals are up; grocery prices are up 25% since 2019; car insurance and gas costs are punishing working families; food bank usage is breaking records in Peel region, which has the highest usage in Ontario; families are juggling multiple jobs to keep a roof over their head; and young Canadians are losing hope that home ownership will ever be possible.

Nonetheless, Bill C-15 contains no real plan to lower inflation, taxes or the cost of living; it is just more spending, photo ops and bureaucracy.

• (1340)

Nowhere is the government's failure clearer than in housing. The Liberals promised to make housing affordable again and, instead, they doubled housing costs, reduced housing starts and plunged the country into the worst housing crisis in our history. Now they want Canadians to believe the Prime Minister's so-called plan will fix it when the budget itself proves the opposite.

The Prime Minister promised to build "at a speed and scale not seen in generations", but what did he deliver? His fourth housing bureaucracy is funded at only half the promised amount. He refused to cut development charges despite promising to cut them in half immediately. His appointed housing officials previously increased development charges by 700% and, according to the Building Industry and Land Development Association, this plan will destroy 100,000 jobs in construction.

Even housing experts were shocked. Mike Moffatt of the Missing Middle Initiative said, "I went into the budget lockup expecting to be disappointed, but I had inadequately prepared myself for how disappointed I would be." The Large Urban Centre Alliance said,

"This budget relies on backward-looking data that provides false reassurances". When someone's own experts, economists and builders reject one's plan, one does not have a plan.

In Brampton and Peel Region, housing prices have more than doubled since 2015. Young families are living in basements because starter homes are out of reach. Newcomers are waiting years just to find affordable rental units. This is not a housing market; it is a crisis created by Liberal policies with excessive money printing, uncontrolled demand pressures and endless red tape. Bill C-15 continues that same failed approach.

Let me be clear. Immigration is a strength for Canada, but it must be planned, managed and supported with housing, infrastructure and transit investments. Under the government, immigration targets were increased dramatically without matching increases in housing supply, without matching investments in infrastructure and without supporting municipalities like Brampton, one of the fastest-growing cities in Canada. Bill C-15 ignores this reality. It offers no plan for infrastructure, no plan for transit and no plan for municipal support, just more bureaucracy and more promises.

Conservatives have a real plan to bring affordability and home ownership back to Canadians: cut the GST on all new homes under \$1.3 million, saving families up to \$65,000 and unleashing new building across the country; tie federal infrastructure dollars to homebuilding, with municipalities having to permit at least 15% more homes each year to receive federal funding; cut development charges by 50%, which the Liberals promised in the last election and failed to deliver; end capital gains tax on reinvestments into new housing in Canada, unlocking billions of dollars in private sector investment to accelerate building; and bring home lower taxes, lower inflation and balanced budgets. Then Canadians could afford the essentials again.

Government Orders

Bill C-15 asks Canadians to trust the same government that created the affordability crisis, the housing crisis and the debt crisis. It asks Canadians to trust the same failed policies, the same empty promises and the same out-of-touch leadership that made life unaffordable. However, Canadians are smarter than that. They know this budget will not build homes, not lower prices and not fix the economy. Canadians deserve a government that respects their money, supports their dreams and builds homes, not bureaucracy.

Bill C-15 is not a budget that would help Canadians. It is a budget that would protect Liberal political survival, not Canadian economic survival. Canadians deserve better. Brampton deserves better. Young families deserve better. Seniors deserve better. They deserve a government that will restore hope, home ownership, affordability and common sense to this country.

Conservatives will bring affordability, accountability and more opportunity. We will bring home the Canadian dream.

• (1345)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about housing, and we agree that housing is an issue. That is the reason the new Prime Minister, along with 60 Liberal members of Parliament, were elected just months ago. We made a commitment to build housing. We are working with municipalities and the provinces. We have created the programs to see a generational investment in housing that is going to double the number of houses being constructed. Let us contrast that to when the leader of the Conservative Party was the minister of housing and built six houses. I do not know where those six houses are, but apparently he built six of them.

How can the member believe that the Conservative policy, which I would suggest is nothing but a dud, would do anything to help the affordability of housing when we have a Prime Minister and a government to committed to increasing the housing supply?

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals keep talking about generational investment. I mentioned in my speech that it is generational theft. It is a generational amortization of our families and of our young kids, those who would pay for the debt the Liberals will create.

On the matter of housing, I am so happy to hear that the member agrees. However, he is unable to identify the problem, which needs to be dealt with in an effective manner so that housing prices can be controlled and people who dream of it can get the homes they want.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague briefly touched on the issue of health care. The Bloc Québécois had called for an increase in health transfers to give more resources to the health care system in Quebec and the provinces that really need them.

Just this morning at the Standing Committee on Health as part of our study on antimicrobials, a witness wrapped up his presentation by saying that more resources are needed, which means more health transfers. We were asking for \$11.6 billion over five years.

What does my colleague think?

[*English*]

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, we all know that Canadians have to rely on health care and today it is a reality that our debt service is much more than the health care transfers to the provinces. We want to see a government that is looking into the specifics and doing what is needed so we can give a better life to Canadians everywhere across the country.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Brampton West touched upon something that I know he is very passionate about, and that is the issue of extortion. Under the Liberal government's soft-on-crime policies, the rate of extortion has exploded 330%. It is because criminals today have more rights than the victims do because of those soft-on-crime policies. I wonder if the member could describe a bit more what Brampton residents are saying about the soft-on-crime Liberal policies and extortions.

• (1350)

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful question. My community in Brampton is really suffering through extortion, shootings and criminal activities. Not a day passes that I do not hear from the people of Brampton that somebody got shot or someone got an extortion call. Recently, I would like to mention, I got a call from a resident who said he had received a call for \$1 million in extortion money. This is unacceptable in this country.

The soft-on-crime Liberal policies have created this mess, and we are suggesting Bill C-242, which would address all the issues. It is called jail not bail. I will ask all the members in Parliament to support this bill so that we can control crime in Brampton and across the country.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate, I have to inform the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola that he will be interrupted by S. O. 31 statements and question period. He will be able to continue after question period.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was having such a good day until you told me I would be interrupted for question period, but democracy cannot wait.

Government Orders

It is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Being in the House, I see many people in the gallery. I am not allowed to point out the firefighters and fire chiefs who may be present, so I just thank them for being present in Ottawa. This includes my own fire chief, though I would not be able to say whether I see him. I met with Mr. Ken Uzeloc earlier. Whether Chief Uzeloc is watching or not, I thank him and I thank all of the fire chiefs who bravely keep us safe.

Today, we are talking about the budget implementation act, Bill C-15. If someone were to ask how the budget implementation act works as opposed to the budget, I would say the budget is a forecast but then we have to actually implement it. Interestingly enough, I was at the SECU committee, which is colloquially called the public safety committee. There, we were talking about CBSA officers because the government promised 1,000 new CBSA officers in April. They said elbows up and that they were going to get them.

I have asked many times where those officers are. Have the Liberals hired any of them? The answer is always no. Today, we heard 57 officers were hired. I asked how many of those 57 officers were hired pursuant to the promise and I was told to look at the budget. The budget implementation act has not passed, so if the money is earmarked for those officers and the government has not brought the spending authority forward, I am not sure if any of them have. It is obviously something to look at. Generally, when we have the president of the CBSA or the commissioner of corrections come to committee, we expect them to know their numbers, so I was disappointed at that.

I was also disappointed when the Prime Minister told young people they would have to make sacrifices. I have children. They are still young; they are not adults yet. I worry about their futures. I still remember when I bought my first house and thought about how far stretched I would be for that house. My wife and I had both just graduated law school. We were making first-year lawyer incomes. A lot of people do not realize the income is not as high as one might expect. We were making money sufficient to pay our bills and we bought our first house in 2008. That house is now double the price it once was as an entry-level home.

When the Prime Minister talks about young people making sacrifices, it is very easy for somebody who is fortunate enough to be an MP, to be very wealthy or to be even marginally wealthy to say they have to sacrifice. It reminds me of when the former prime minister, Justin Trudeau, said veterans were asking for more than we could give. It was awful. We need to be taking care of the people who take care of us. It is not lost on me that we have first responders here, yet we send our money everywhere but to the people on the ground.

Where are the houses? I was stopped in the airport two days ago by people in my riding of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola who talked about how low housing starts are. If we listen to any of the ministers on the front benches, we would want to do cartwheels based on how great the economy is, but I do not listen to the people on the front benches. I listen to people in my riding. If we want to know whether something is working, we talk to the people on the ground. Frankly, I think I can speak for my Conservative colleagues when I say we have had enough of people in ivory towers telling us

that we have never had it so good. People in my riding are lined up at the food bank.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, the minister said that our leader lives in an ivory tower.

• (1355)

The Speaker: Excuse me. We are in debate, so we have one person speaking at a time. I understand there can be heckling from time to time, which is a normal part of House affairs, but that was a bit more than a heckle and was entering into debate.

We will let the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola continue.

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, if we ever had to have an example of someone in an ivory tower, it is the minister from northern Saskatchewan here, who will not even listen to what my constituents are telling me.

The Liberals say that Canadians have never had it so good. I would say that young people have never had it be so challenging. We have people who do not have a house.

My parents came to Canada without two pennies to rub together. Now their son is a member of Parliament. They lived the Canadian dream. Hard work paid off for them, but I do not see that dream being fulfilled. In fact, I see that dream being the opposite for new Canadians and for young people, with the Prime Minister telling us that people have to make more sacrifices.

I am going to wait here for question period, because we are going to probably hear, since we hear it so often, that Canada has the lowest debt to GDP in the G7.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, the member from northern Saskatchewan said, “Hear, hear!” I wonder if that member will stand up, give a speech and talk about the provincial debt, the federal debt and whether the provincial debt and the federal debt, if combined—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Frank Caputo: I am striking a chord now, Mr. Speaker. This is good—

• (1400)

The Speaker: It is called being on the cusp of disorder. I will let the member continue, but let us not try to be provocative. That is the key. Let us not try to be provocative on either side, because that just leads to disorder.

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, we hear about debt to GDP, and we have a debt-to-GDP ratio, but we have two levels of government in this country. When the government says that we have the lowest debt to GDP, is it actually counting the provincial debt in there? What about Crown debt? Is it counting that?

Statements by Members

I will be honest with members. I have not done the calculations, so maybe I am completely out to lunch on this. If I am out to lunch, the Liberals can feel free to let me know. However, I would love for a member of the Liberals, who are so gleeful to tell us about our debt-to-GDP ratio, to tell us that they are factoring in provincial debt, Crown debt and federal debt as opposed to just the national debt that countries without our two-level government system have. I challenge any member from that party to do so. Again, we will probably hear that we have never had it so good.

I am quite saddened with the budget. There were a number of asks in my riding. The District of Clearwater is estimating a population boom, with an increase of 60% to 80% in the next six to 10 years, if an expected mine goes through.

I look forward to having more truth and more light shed after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

GIVING TUESDAY

Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Giving Tuesday, a global day of generosity and community, an opportunity to reflect on local needs, support important causes and give through donations or volunteering. Volunteering is how we learn about ourselves and the world. It is woven into who we are as Canadians, and we are people who care.

According to the “World Giving Index”, Canada ranks 11th for generosity, yet Volunteer Canada and Statistics Canada report a decades-long decline in volunteer hours and participation. This matters because organizations, such as United Way Greater Toronto, The Neighbourhood Group, Scadding Court Community Centre and Crossroads International, rely on volunteers to deliver essential supports to our most vulnerable.

Volunteering strengthens belonging, reduces social isolation, builds lifelong skills and weaves together a stronger community fabric. It reminds us that we coexist and we thrive together. Even a few hours can make a real difference for the volunteers and the organizations that receive their support.

On this Giving Tuesday, and throughout the holiday season, I encourage Canadians to give what they can, and even more importantly, to give their time, when possible.

* * *

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION HOTLINE

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, five years ago, in December 2020, the House came together to support my motion to bring a simple, life-saving idea to Canada: A three-digit suicide prevention crisis line, or 988.

One thousand days later, 988 launched in November 2023. Since that time, over a million calls and texts have been made to 988. Every one of those calls or texts represents someone reaching out instead of giving up, but sadly, 12 Canadians die by suicide each day

and a further 200 attempt suicide each day. That is 73,000 Canadians.

This is why 988 must be the beginning, not the end. As we enter the Christmas season, we must remember that many Canadians suffer silently and fall through the gaps.

If someone is struggling, I ask them to please reach out. Help is only a call or text away, regardless of where they are. They can dial or text 988 24-7. I ask them to remember they are needed, are loved and our world is a better place with them in it.

* * *

STUDENTS IN WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE

Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past month, I had a chance to visit three schools in my riding where students are bringing about positive change in the world.

At École Robert H. Smith, students raised thousands of dollars for CancerCare Manitoba by organizing drink sales that saw them working early hours on top of their regularly scheduled academic responsibilities. They put the needs of others ahead of their own.

Over at Earl Grey School, nearly 50 students, guided by educator Lily Godinez Goodman, formed a media literacy club and started a school newspaper. Their commitment to citizenship can be held up as a model for all to follow. I experienced first-hand the challenge of being in the lion's den of one of their media scrums.

At Linden Meadows School, under the leadership of teachers Colleen Nelson and Alex McGavin, students are dedicating time regularly to debating ideas. They are staying engaged with the world around them and are doing it in a respectful way.

I am so proud to represent these bright young people, who are paving the way for a future full of kindness, compassion and hope.

* * *

LOCAL CHARITIES

Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Christmas is right around the corner, and in Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, the festivities are already in full swing, with Santa Claus parades, Christmas markets and, most importantly, the spirit of giving.

Year-round in my community, charities do outstanding work to help the residents of our community, especially during the holiday season. Our local charities, such as the Barrie Food Bank, the Elm-vale and District Food Bank, Christmas Cheer, Senior Wish Association, the Salvation Army and Barrie Families Unite, work tirelessly to help support families in putting food on the table and gifts under the tree.

As we enter this giving season, I encourage all those who are able to do so to donate to a local food bank or shelter. To those who need help during these challenging times, please know that these organizations in their community will be there to help support them. I thank the employees, volunteers and donors who help support the vital work of these charities.

From my family to the families of all members, I wish everyone a very merry Christmas, happy holidays and happy new year. To the students who are here from Barrie today, *joyeux Noël*.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GROWING UP WITH THE URSULINES EXHIBITION

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to all those who helped create the new permanent exhibition “Growing Up with the Ursulines” at the Pôle culturel du Monastère des Ursulines in Quebec City, in the beautiful riding of Québec Centre.

The result of more than four years of work, this exhibition pays tribute to 400 years of educational and social engagement by the Ursuline Sisters, women who have left a profound mark on the social, cultural and intellectual development of the greater Quebec City area and across the country. The exhibition “Growing Up with the Ursulines” features six thematic rooms and more than 180 objects and archives, including the founding document signed by King Louis XIII. It shows visitors how these visionary women helped advance the status of women in Quebec City and Quebec.

I invite all members of the House, as well as everyone listening to us, to come visit this exhibition and experience the exceptional legacy of the Ursuline Sisters.

* * *

● (1405)

[*English*]

CANADIAN FILIPINO COMMUNITY

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the amazing contributions of the Canadian Filipino community from coast to coast to coast. Filipino culture is one that values faith, family, community, hard work and loyalty. From Vancouver to White Horse and St. John's, Filipino families have contributed greatly through their hard work and community involvement. Rarely will I find a church or community group without pancit, Tagalog and friendly smiles.

I myself am honoured to be married to a Canadian Filipina, and I have had the privilege of meeting with Filipino leaders all across our great country. Today, I want to recognize in particular one of those community leaders: Carlos Cabaneros, who is here on Parlia-

Statements by Members

ment Hill today. Carlos is the creative genius behind Filipinos in the 6ix, the largest online North American Filipino page promoting Filipino culture and values.

Join me in recognizing the amazing contributions of Filipinos all over Canada, and let us celebrate our shared values of family, freedom, community and hard work.

Maraming Salamat Po. Tara Na.

* * *

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Kanata, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through the Canada summer jobs program, young people in my community are gaining valuable work experience, developing new skills and earning an income while contributing to our community. Last summer, our government committed more than \$1.3 million to youth in my community. This funding helped create over 320 amazing student jobs. These opportunities are helping young people grow through hands-on work with organizations such as the Dave Smith Youth Treatment Centre, the YMCA, STEM Camp, the Diefenbunker and the Kanata Food Cupboard.

These opportunities not only build confidence and skills, but also strengthen the community organizations that serve residents every day. Applications for the 2026 season are now open until December 11. I encourage organizations and small businesses to take part and give a young person a chance to learn and to contribute.

* * *

FOOD SECURITY

Jim Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of fiscal mismanagement by the Liberals, the affordability of daily life is out of reach for many Ontarians. According to Feed Ontario's 2025 “Hunger Report”, more than 1 million Ontarians needed a food bank this year, marking a record-breaking 8.7 million visits to food banks in 2025. In Chelmsford, 1,300 people regularly visit the local food bank per month.

This need is being largely driven by the poor decisions of the Liberal government, which drive up inflation and the cost of daily necessities for all Canadians.

Today is Giving Tuesday, and I will be making a personal donation of food and other items to the fill a crib initiative in Greater Sudbury. As a record number of Canadians struggle, I encourage others across the country to do the same if they are able.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

JEAN-CLAUDE GERMAIN

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Jean-Claude Germain passed away earlier this year, leaving behind a stir of words, stories and laughter that still buzz in our ears to this day. Two weeks ago, he was given a warm and colourful tribute at the Centre du Théâtre d'aujourd'hui. Playwright, screenwriter, writer, journalist, lyricist, historian and so much more: with Germain, the labels jostled for position like actors in the wings. He was larger than life and had a knack for capturing all of Quebec in a single well-turned phrase.

From *Le Petit Journal* to honorary chair of the Salon du livre de Montréal, he shook up Quebec theatre until it spoke in joul and stood on its own two feet. I knew him at *L'aut'journal*. Working alongside him was like taking a class where the professor laughed louder than everyone else in the room. His entire body of work is a mirror reflecting our wrinkles and our smiles back at us, and we say to ourselves, yes, that is us, and we can be damn proud of it.

I salute Jean-Claude and I thank him.

* * *

• (1410)

[English]

PANAMERICAN OPTIMIST CHAMPIONSHIP

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an exceptional young athlete from Hubbards, 13-year-old Asher Davis. Asher has been selected to represent Canada at the inaugural Panamerican Optimist Championship in Buenos Aires next month. Out of 15 youth across the country, he is the only sailor chosen from Atlantic Canada, which is an incredible achievement and a proud moment for our community.

A proud member of the Hubbards Sailing Club, he has been training tirelessly to meet this moment. His family and neighbours have rallied with him, showing once again how our communities lift up their young people and help them reach big opportunities and experiences.

I ask all members to join in congratulating Asher today and wishing him the very best next month as he represents team Canada and the South Shore on the world stage. I send my congratulations to Asher. We are all cheering him on.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the talented scientists, engineers and technicians in Chalk River perform leading-edge nuclear research while also producing life-saving medical isotopes. Now the elbows-down Brookfield government wants to pay an all-American consortium \$1.2 billion a year to manage Canadian Nuclear Laboratories. We know the Prime Minister has a financial interest in the consortium. Canadians have concerns about the American-owned monopoly having control over Canada's medical isotopes and unique nuclear analytic capabilities.

The Competition Bureau has launched three investigations, yet the bureau has been forced to obtain court orders to get the information it needs from the secretive, self-serving Brookfield government. Canadians want the Liberals to stop blocking the investigation into the deal. Canadian intellectual property and the jobs that technology brings will be lost if the Brookfield Prime Minister gets his way.

* * *

2025 QUEENS OF HARMONY

Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary achievement by Synergy, a local barbershop quartet in Nova Scotia.

Earlier this month, in Hershey, Pennsylvania, the Synergy quartet was crowned the 2025 Queens of Harmony at the international harmony competition, representing eastern Canada on the world stage and competing against top quartets from across North America. This is the first time since 1993 that a quartet from Area 1, which includes nine chapters across the four Atlantic provinces, has earned this title, and it is only the third time in the region's history. The quartet includes Sue Kember and Jennifer Cleveland of HRM's ScotianAires Chorus, alongside Adèle Merrit and Corinna Garriock of Valley Voices.

Their victory reflects the musical excellence that exists in our province and the strength of our women-led arts communities. It also speaks to the value of supporting Canada's homegrown arts sector so that talent like this can continue to succeed.

Congratulations to the Synergy quartet and everyone involved in bringing home this well-deserved international honour.

* * *

HOUSING

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are promises, and then there is reality. The Prime Minister's promise was a so-called generational investment to rapidly scale up housing to meet his target of half a million homes a year. The reality is, as the budget watchdog said this morning, that the new bureaucracy will actually build only 5,200 homes per year. This means the Liberals are more than one million homes short over the next five years and will address only 4% of Canada's housing gap. The future is not any brighter.

Yesterday, the Missing Middle Initiative reported that housing starts are down across nearly every GTA municipality, but Conservatives have not given up on the Canadian dream: the dream to earn, save and own a home. That is why Conservatives will incentivize municipalities to cut building taxes; spend less and keep interest rates down, so mortgages can be affordable; and scrap the industrial carbon tax on steel, lumber and every single thing that builds a Canadian home.

* * *

[Translation]

L'ENTOURELLE

Sophie Chatel (Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, during this week of remembrance and action on violence against women, I would like to congratulate and express my full support for L'EntourElle, an essential organization in my riding.

I would like to thank Gisèle, Ashley, Christie, Ollisha, Cassey and Chantal, and everyone who works with and supports their vital work.

They are making a difference in the riding through their courage, determination and professionalism. They provide hope to all women survivors and victims of domestic violence.

Today, we honour them and support everything they do. We stand with these dedicated women; they have my thanks.

* * *

• (1415)

[English]

ETHICS

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is riddled with conflicts of interest, and companies like Brookfield are raking it in while he is at the helm. Not only did the Prime Minister help his company avoid paying \$6.5 billion in taxes, but it is now also Canada's greatest tax-dodger. Is it a bike shop in Bermuda? That is no problem. Is it a couple of tax havens in the Cayman Islands? It will use anything to keep Brookfield outside the reach of the CRA.

Ordinary Canadians are struggling to put food on their plates and a roof over their heads, while the Prime Minister's elite friends just keep benefiting. His so-called ethics screen is mostly a joke. The ethics committee found that 95% of Brookfield's companies, nearly 1,900 of them, are not included. If they perform well, the Prime Minister is going to reap the reward. It is no wonder he wants to help them. Instead of avoiding questions, as he helped Brookfield avoid taxes, the Prime Minister needs to come clean.

Is the Prime Minister here to serve Canadians or Brookfield and himself? Conservatives will not stop asking questions. We will expose this sleaziness and fight to make sure that it stops.

* * *

CANADA'S VOLUNTEER AWARD WINNER

David Myles (Fredericton—Oromocto, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Constantine Passaris, a constituent of Fredericton—Oromocto who was recently awarded the 2024

Oral Questions

Canada's Volunteer Awards Atlantic prize for his outstanding contributions to building a welcoming and inclusive New Brunswick. For more than 50 years, Constantine has dedicated thousands of volunteer hours to connecting people from diverse backgrounds and championing collaboration.

[Translation]

As the founder of the New Brunswick Multicultural Council, his expertise has guided immigration policy throughout the Atlantic region.

[English]

Constantine has been an inspirational leader and a role model for New Brunswick's multicultural community, and his unwavering commitment to diversity and inclusion continues to enrich our province.

I ask members to join me in congratulating Dr. Constantine Passaris and thanking him for championing multiculturalism in New Brunswick.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just appointed another Trudeau-era minister who destroyed our immigration system and helped drive up the cost of living. This same minister, who is responsible for heritage, just said this morning that he is fed up with the debate on the decline of the French language.

The Conservatives are not fed up. We will defend the French language.

Of all the Liberal members the Prime Minister could have appointed, why did he appoint someone who is fed up with defending the French language and Quebec culture?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is keeping immigration levels under control. The number of asylum seekers—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Right Hon. Mark Carney: I would like to continue, Mr. Speaker. The number of asylum seekers has dropped significantly, by one-third. The number of foreign students has also dropped significantly.

We will defend the French language with the largest investments in the cultural sector in the history of Canada.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question was about the statement made by his new minister, who said he was fed up with the debate on the decline of the French language. The Prime Minister's response shows that we should all be concerned about the decline of the French language.

Oral Questions

Of all the Liberal members, why did he choose to appoint someone who is fed up with defending the French language and Quebec culture?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I support my new minister and I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who is against the \$4-billion action plan for the French language. He is against investments in Quebec's cultural sector. He is against increasing francophone immigration to Canada.

We are standing up for the French language. We are standing up for a great Canada.

* * *

● (1420)

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we learned today that eight months after the Prime Minister was elected, promising to build nation-building projects at speeds not seen in generations, he has not even begun consulting with first nations people about his promised pipeline to the Pacific.

Now the Assembly of First Nations has condemned his plan because he has not done any consulting with them. Today, he will address the assembly.

Will he for once say one thing, no matter the group he is speaking to, and be clear that he wants the pipeline to get built and that he will get the consultations done to make it happen?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the great thing about Hansard is that it can be consulted to find out what the member opposite said last week. In effect, would we ram through a pipeline? No, never.

We will consult, for free, prior and informed consent, with first nations. We will work with the Province of British Columbia. We have conditions in the MOU with Alberta. We know how to work with the provinces. We know how to consult. We know how to respect. Does the member opposite?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, transcripts are great things.

The Prime Minister just renamed Justin Trudeau's immigration minister to cabinet: the guy who destroyed our immigration system and helped double the housing costs in this country. The minister has now had something to say about the Prime Minister's failure to consult on pipelines. He said that the consultation should have started yesterday, and it cannot be done on a desktop, making reference to his fellow minister's promise that they would do consultations by Zoom.

Why is it that the Prime Minister did not start consulting first nations eight months ago? Is it because he does not care what they have to say, or is it because he just does not want the pipeline to get built?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this situation is very complicated for the member opposite.

First off, we have to have a pipeline project. We have to have a private proponent. In order for that to happen, we had to create the conditions precedent. We have now done that, because we talked to the provinces and we worked with the provinces.

In the Building Canada Act, which was passed before the member opposite returned to this House, we set out the consultation process for nation-building projects.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he has broken his promise to get big projects built, and now we learn that he has broken his promise to get houses built. He promised, during the election, that he would double home building to 500,000 units per year. Today, the Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed that his brand new bureaucracy will build only 5,000 homes per year, 99% fewer than he promised.

After Conservatives built well over 200,000 homes at half the cost of today, why will the Prime Minister not listen to us and stop building bureaucracy so that we can start building homes?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the great thing about someone being a lifelong member of Parliament is that they have never built anything and they do not know numbers. They do not even read the PBO report where it says we will contribute to projects containing 86,868 units, at \$130,000 a unit. That is what we are doing.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing that member built when he was the governor of the Bank of England was the housing crisis in that country. Then he built a tax haven in the Caribbean so he would not have to pay the same taxes he imposes on the Canadian people.

Our youth need homes, jobs and hope. The Prime Minister offers them only broken promises and more sacrifices. He even held a photo op in front of a house that was dismantled after he left it. Here we have a Prime Minister whose houses disappear after he announces them and whose promises disappear after he makes them.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the house in that announcement was sent to Nunavut. Nunavut is one of the territories of this great country. Nunavut is more than just a place to fly in, make a photo op and not speak to the Premier of Nunavut. Nunavut is where we are building 700 houses under Build Canada Homes, houses that are cheaper, houses that are more efficient, houses that will work for the economy.

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Prime Minister announced an agreement with Alberta that is surprising in many respects. I am thinking in particular of the fact that, the day before, I had asked the government whether it would make a solemn commitment not to allow any pipeline to pass through British Columbia without the free consent of the British Columbia government and first nations. The House leader stood up and told me that nothing would be done without their consent. The next day, the announcement was made.

Am I right in thinking that this matter had already been settled and that we were lied to?

The Speaker: Members must be careful about the language they use. The language used does not break any rules, but it may provoke a certain reaction, and one reaction can lead to another. Together, these two reactions may cause disorder.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, we respect the provinces's rights. We respect the rights of British Columbia. The memorandum of understanding clearly states that the Government of Canada and the Province of Alberta will work together with British Columbia. An agreement is required for there to be a pipeline.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when one wants to get a party's agreement, then that party should be invited to participate in the agreement from the get-go. The contract the Prime Minister signed applies regardless, even without British Columbia.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that he did not respect what was said in the House and that there was not much respect for the truth when this agreement was signed? The agreement was being finalized at the very moment we were receiving a response here.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is not a contract. It is a memorandum of understanding. Second, these are not sufficient conditions, but necessary conditions. This is not the end of a process. It is the beginning of a process: a process with Alberta, British Columbia, and, most importantly, indigenous peoples.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a document that he signed and that creates obligations. It is a contract. He can call it whatever he likes in the language of his choice.

Given the issues surrounding the oil tanker moratorium, the issues surrounding the cap on greenhouse gas emissions, British Columbia's lack of agreement and the opposition of the first nations that voted against the agreement this morning, does the Prime Minister not think that he should reopen the agreement and ensure that the parties are signatories by free and informed consent?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, it is a memorandum of understanding that includes commit-

Oral Questions

ments and significant investments by the Province of Alberta in greenhouse gas storage.

Second, it increases the industrial carbon price to six times what it is now, in an effective way. It also introduces stricter methane regulations.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they cannot build homes if they run out of the House. This what the Prime Minister is doing right now.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that is very close to the line, and his colleagues know there is no singing in the House.

The hon. leader has the floor.

• (1430)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, it is very sad the Prime Minister does not want to debate how we get homes for our youth. Our young people deserve homes, jobs and hope. He was feeling very cocky a few minutes ago until he worried I might present him with the facts. The Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed today that his new housing bureaucracy will build only 5,000 homes per year, which is barely 1% of the 500,000 homes he promised during the election. Construction is falling off the cliff.

Why will the Prime Minister not stand in the House and debate it?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the record, the Prime Minister is doing his job, and now he is off to speak with the Assembly of First Nations. He is doing the job of the Prime Minister of Canada, not standing in the House doing quippy quips for Twitter—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We do not know when that now is because it is not necessarily talking about the present, but at some point. “Now” is a large concept.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister could be debating. He has plenty of time—

The Speaker: I thought the hon. member was done, but he was not done. I'm sorry. I apologize.

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Prime Minister is doing his job and is off to give an address and consult with the Assembly of First Nations, not doing quippy quips for Twitter with the Leader of the Opposition, which I know the Leader of the Opposition would very much like to do as he likes to obstruct, obfuscate and, as he has shown earlier in question period, not have a single handle on a single fact about a single indicator on life in this country.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us speak about indicators then. I am going to quote the Parliamentary Budget Officer:

Build Canada Homes [the Prime Minister's program] is presented as part of the Government's efforts to double the pace of housing construction over the next decade. That said, the Government has not yet laid out an overall plan to achieve this goal. We anticipate that the contribution of Build Canada Homes will likely be modest and estimate that the program will add about 26,000 units over five years, representing a 2.1 per cent increase in housing completions....

This is not the 100% increase the Prime Minister promised. Was this just another bait and switch?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite took the time to actually read the report, he would discover that the Parliamentary Budget Officer stated this will build 86,000 affordable homes across Canada. This is the initial investment. I know it is hard for the Conservatives to understand. We are going in phases here. The initial phase is \$13 billion, which they voted against in the budget. They are doing nothing to build homes, which matches the opposition leader's record in the past of six homes.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that minister was literally the mayor of the city that became the most expensive housing market in all of North America, more expensive than New York, Los Angeles and Chicago. He now brags that not only will they build only about 2% of the homes that they promised during the election, but they are spending \$13 billion to do it. Failing is bad. Failing expensively is even worse.

Rather than having the costly mayor stand up and answer for him, will the Prime Minister have the courage to answer for himself? Where are the homes he promised?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the City of Thunder Bay, which just passed, through its council—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The minister may begin from the top.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Mr. Speaker, all across the country, municipalities are stepping up to make new housing available for some of the most vulnerable people in our community. Take the City of Thunder Bay, which, just last night, through its council, approved a motion to free up surplus city land for 1,400 homes. It is facilitated by the housing accelerator fund. That is the work of a government that is behind communities and that is behind people.

Here is what we can say about the Conservatives. They vote against the very people who need that help. We are building Canada

strong with municipalities like the municipality of Marathon, which is here today.

• (1435)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for pointing out that we have voted against every single program that doubled housing costs in Canada.

The Prime Minister created the biggest housing crisis in the G7 when he was the Bank of England governor. He has now come here to adopt the same Trudeau-era policies of building bureaucracies rather than building homes. He promised that this was all going to change and that the latest bureaucracy would change everything, but today the Parliamentary Budget Officer proved that he will only build 2% of what he promised.

Why does the Prime Minister block homes and break promises?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is rich for the Leader of the Opposition to speak about this. As we all know, when he was the housing minister and I was the mayor of Vancouver, he built six homes as the housing minister. That is a deplorable record. It is deplorable that the members opposite will not support a budget that has \$13 billion for affordable housing, which the Parliamentary Budget Officer states will build 86,000 affordable homes.

You will not vote for that. You will not support affordable housing, and that matches your historical record.

The Speaker: Address questions and comments through the Chair, please.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was 200,000 homes and the average cost of buying one was \$450,000. The average rent for a one-bedroom was \$900. The government came along and built bureaucracy to block homes and printed money to inflate their costs. They allowed mass immigration that was out of control, which ballooned demand and left us with the worst and most expensive housing anywhere in the G7.

Today, the Parliamentary Budget Officer blew the lid off their latest promises, showing that they will build almost none of the homes that they promised in the last election. Why will the Prime Minister not stand in the House and take account for that?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the lid has been blown off but the lid has been blown off the tired lines that the Leader of the Opposition has been using for two years. He has systematically stood in the way of investments in supportive, social, low-cost and low-income housing in the country throughout his exclusive 20-year career in the House of Commons. He has systematically stood in the way of supports like dental care, like child care, like the Canadian child benefit, like school nutrition, the very things that he pretends to care about in the House but would vote against. Canadians know that he would vote against everything with “care” in the name.

He needs to—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for us to vote against affordable housing because there is no affordable housing after 10 years of a Liberal government. One idea, one positive idea, that we could all agree on is to reduce the cost of the steel, the concrete, the cement and the glass that goes into building homes. Unfortunately, the Liberal government has an industrial carbon tax whose stated purpose is to raise the cost of all of those things.

Why will they not accept this positive idea to take taxes off of homebuilding so that our youth can finally have homes, jobs and hope like they deserve?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was distressing to see member of Parliament after member of Parliament from the Conservative side vote against and argue against relieving consumers of the price of carbon, which we have, in the bill in front of the House, promised to do. They have voted against. They will vote against a tax cut for 22 million Canadians. It is again something that Conservatives like to talk about, lower taxes, but in actuality, they fight against it.

Who are they really fighting for? It is sure not the Canadians or the Conservatives I am talking to in Thunder Bay—Superior North.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the industrial carbon tax is not just a tax on homes; it is a tax on food. When we tax the steel that goes into farm equipment and the fertilizer that is necessary to grow food, when we tax the food processor, we tax the food. It is no wonder that since the Prime Minister took office, food prices have increased roughly 40% faster in Canada than they have in the United States. Canadians deserve affordable, nutritious, delicious food on their plates.

Will the Prime Minister stand up now and agree to get rid of the industrial carbon tax so that Canadians can afford to eat?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we go again with the imaginary taxes. As my colleague just said, when presented with the opportunity to vote for a tax cut for

every single income-tax payer in this country, they say no. When they get a chance to vote to remove the GST for first-time homebuyers, they say no. When they get the chance to vote for the removal of the consumer carbon tax, what do the Conservatives say? No.

When the time comes to vote to give Canadians a break, what do the Conservatives say?

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the new Minister responsible for Official Languages is already fed up with his mandate. He thinks that saying that French is in decline is about electioneering. He thinks that saying that Montreal is being anglicized is an identity-based grievance. That is how he is starting his mandate. For him, it is very clear that defending French is a boring file that gives racist, xenophobic separatists a chance to complain.

Why did the Prime Minister appoint someone who is opposed to protecting the French language as the official languages minister?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I went to elementary school, junior high, high school and CEGEP in French. I completed a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in French and I raised my children in three languages, one of which was French. I love French, and I will defend our beautiful language until the day that I die.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know what the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture should be fed up with. He should be fed up with Ottawa twiddling its thumbs while French is in decline. He should be fed up with Ottawa continuing to fund English in Quebec while French is under threat. He should be fed up with the fact that fewer and fewer Quebecers are able to listen to music in French, read in French and see shows in French, because our language is under threat everywhere.

As the minister takes on his new role, will he choose to be fed up with the right things?

Oral Questions

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I am fed up with is the politicization of our beautiful language, which we want to promote across the country. I know that the Bloc Québécois members care deeply about French. What I am asking them to do is to join us and all other members who care about French in using our strong francophone strategy, which for the first time in our history has \$4.1 billion to spend on supporting French. We will do so throughout our term, and we will defend French. As for me, I will defend French in our country for the rest of my days.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, CTV reports that 35,000 households left the GTA last year because the cost of housing is simply too expensive. The Missing Middle Initiative reported yesterday that “Ontario’s housing engine has stalled”. In the GTA, preconstruction sales for condos are down 89%, and for ground-oriented homes, they are down 65%. This means that starts have fallen off a cliff, and it means it is going to be worse in 2026.

My question is, when the Prime Minister told young Canadians that they would have to sacrifice, was he really referring to the dream of home ownership?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we obviously face challenges in Ontario, in the GTA in particular, around housing starts. That is exactly why we got Build Canada Homes launched. That is exactly why we are investing in affordable housing at an unprecedented scale. That is exactly why we brought forward the first-time homebuyers’ GST tax cut, which members opposite have stalled since June.

We need to take action. We are taking action in this House. The Conservatives are voting against action on affordable housing.

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister’s fourth housing bureaucracy, Build Canada Homes, replaces Justin Trudeau’s life-changing national housing strategy with less money and even bigger promises.

We need 480,000 homes per year in the next 10 years to restore affordability, but the Parliamentary Budget Officer reports that Build Canada Homes will only build about 26,000 over the next five. So, why will the Prime Minister not listen to home builders, housing experts and the Leader of the Opposition and axe the tax on all homes under \$1.3 million?

● (1445)

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we had a lot of engagement with the homebuilding industry, with mayors and with ministers. We have put in an enormous amount of effort. Members opposite can go out and talk to people in the community and home builders we are working with who are supporting Build Canada Homes. We

have just launched and opened the portal for that. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says 87,000 homes will be built as part of this initial effort. The national housing strategy starts again in the years ensuing. It is a combination that will deliver affordable housing at an unprecedented scale.

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government promised billions in housing spending, but today, the Parliamentary Budget Officer exposed that this program is exactly like the last four: an absolute failure. This is just another example of the Liberals promising the same old things and never delivering. Their new housing program is supposed to get only 26,000 homes built in five years, only a fraction of the 2.5 million promised.

How will the Prime Minister tell this horrible news to young people? Will he simply ask them to make more sacrifices?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for me to point out that my colleague in the opposition from Newfoundland and Labrador has voted against every opportunity to help Canadians: housing, the school food program, \$10-a-day child care, dental care, and on and on. This is nothing but a circle of tired notes.

We need to work together. Canadians want us to work together. I will tell my colleague that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians want to see results.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people should be able to work hard, save their money and buy a reasonably priced home in a reasonable timeline. That was the Canadian promise. However, today, the parliamentary budget watchdog confirmed that the Liberal Prime Minister has broken this promise. The report says that the Liberals’ brand new housing bureaucracy is nothing more than a shiny, billion-dollar photo-op machine, building only 26,000 homes in five years. That is barely 2% of the 1.25 million homes promised. What is worse, the report says that the Liberal government has no plan whatsoever to achieve its own target.

Instead of lecturing young Canadians about sacrifice, why does the Liberal Prime Minister not just admit that he bulldozed the dream of home ownership, buried it under bureaucracy and walked away with the shovel?

Oral Questions

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member was speaking very fast, and I could not keep up with the question, but I do want to say one thing. Canadians elected us to do big things. We are going to build a stronger economy and a stronger country. We are making the largest infrastructure investment in Canadian history. That party voted against it. We are going to be building roads and bridges, community centres, hospitals and transit, using Canadian steel and Canadian lumber. However, the Conservatives voted against all of that, every single part of it, against housing and against major projects, which are opportunities for Canadian workers.

On this side of the House, we will keep building. We are going to be standing with our workers, unlike the Conservatives.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Regroupement des offices d'habitation du Québec and the Alliance des corporations d'habitations abordables du territoire du Québec shared their deep concerns: The demand for social and affordable housing is skyrocketing and yet the Liberal response is more bureaucracy.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer also confirms that the Liberals' big promise of 250,000 homes will actually produce only 26,000 homes, that is, 10 times fewer homes. In Montmorency—Charlevoix, the average price of a home has grown from \$205,000 to \$400,000 under this Liberal government. The Prime Minister said that young Canadians would have to make sacrifices.

In fact, was he actually asking them to sacrifice their dream of one day owning a home?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a big leap for a Conservative member to talk about affordable housing. In my 10 years in politics, I have never met a housing organization that has praised the Conservative Party. At every turn, that party has always voted against investments in affordable and social housing. That is, when they do not outright disparage the concept.

On this side of the House, we are investing \$13 billion to build affordable housing in a way that Canada has never done before.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Wade Chang (Burnaby Central, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, victims' groups, police chiefs, police associations, provinces, territories and municipalities have all called for the quick passage of Bill C-14, the bail and sentencing reform act. As hate crimes continue to rise, communities across Canada are urging us to move forward on Bill C-9, the combatting hate act. However, instead of helping advance this important work, Conservatives have been filibustering the justice committee, blocking witnesses and delaying progress.

Can the secretary of state update this House on the impact of these Conservative delays and tell us what needs to happen so that we can get this done for Canadians?

• (1450)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, do members know who is paying the price for these Conservative games? It is Canadians. While victims' groups and frontline police officers are asking for us to act urgently and respond to the crisis, the Conservatives are spending their time filibustering with nonsense speeches about cats and dogs. Members heard that right: cats and dogs. These are procedural stunts that they are playing in order to stop these bills from passing through committee. They are obstructing the committee from doing its job. When it comes to public safety, the Conservatives have a lot of bark, but no bite. They are standing in the way—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kildonan—St. Paul.

* * *

STEEL AND ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Algoma Steel laid off 1,000 workers, and those workers remember when the Liberal Prime Minister stood on their shop floor in Sault Ste. Marie just days before the last election and promised to protect their jobs. Today, those same workers face U.S. tariffs, no deal and now no job. To add insult to injury, the Liberal government just gave Algoma Steel \$400 million with no jobs guarantees, apparently, because now there are 1,000 Canadian workers out of a job before Christmas.

When will the steelworkers get the promised protection for their jobs from the Liberal government?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course, our thoughts are with the workers at Algoma Steel. I have been in contact with the company. I have also been in contact with the union. We know the entire business model of the steel sector in Canada is based on U.S. automakers. Obviously, with unjustifiable tariffs of 50% by the U.S. administration against our steel sector, this can happen. We have been working with the company by offering \$400 million to get through these difficult times as it is pivoting with new products and new markets.

*Oral Questions***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to protect Canadian jobs, yet the reality is that thousands of Canadian families are now going without their primary source of income because the Liberals have not delivered on their promises. Softwood lumber mills are closing, auto companies are cancelling projects in Canada and moving them to the United States, and now in Sault Ste. Marie, 1,000 people have just lost their jobs at the steel mill. Workers do not need more Liberal platitudes, corporate handouts or broken promises. They need their jobs back. They need results.

When are Canadians going to get the trade deal they were promised?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a news flash: We are in a trade war. Therefore, because of what is happening right now, we are fighting for the jobs at Algoma Steel and across the steel sector in the country. That is why we have been there for the—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The minister may continue.

Hon. Mélanie Joly: Mr. Speaker, my point is that we will continue to fight for these jobs. The company was clear today: If it was not for that \$400 million and the \$100 million from Ontario, the very existence of Algoma Steel would be in jeopardy.

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I say condolences to the 1,000 workers laid off from Algoma Steel in my hometown of Sault Ste. Marie. My dad, Tony, worked at Algoma for over 30 years. The Prime Minister is squarely to blame for these layoffs. In the election, our elbows-up PM said he was the guy who could get a good trade deal with Donald Trump. Instead of a deal, the PM said, “Who cares?” We then saw higher tariffs on Canadian goods. The results are these layoffs and others.

When will the Prime Minister finally get a deal with Trump?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague and a lot of respect for his dad and for all the people who have worked or are working at Algoma Steel. That is why our priority and my priority is to make sure they can continue to earn a great salary at Algoma Steel as the company is adapting to new types of steel for the defence sector and also for the housing sector.

I must say that our buy Canadian policy is also helping Algoma and other steel plants as we continue to fight for these jobs across the country.

* * *

• (1455)

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of talent to create unemployment while spending \$15 billion.

Food banks are swamped, but the Prime Minister would rather act as an ATM for multinationals. He is giving \$15 billion to Stellantis and \$400 million to Algoma Steel, and yet the result is job losses.

Can the Prime Minister explain his wonderful strategy that involves paying big business to layoff Canadians?

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are protecting essential programs that millions of Canadians count on. Six million children count on the Canada child benefit and 5 million people count on the Canadian dental care plan.

On this side of the House we are busy helping and supporting families, while the members opposite oppose all of those measures and vote against them.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure she understood my question, so I will ask it again.

Canadians can no longer afford to put food on the table because of the cost of living, and this government continues to empty their pockets and fill those of big corporations. This Prime Minister found \$72 million for Nokia, \$400 million for Algoma Steel and \$15 billion for Stellantis. What do the Liberals get in return? Job cuts.

Is this the new Liberal strategy: make Canadians poorer in order to make big business richer?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this side of the House feels it is important to support the sectors that have been affected by the tariff war with the United States.

I would note, however, that my colleague voted against a tax cut that represents approximately \$800 per family in Canada and Quebec. She voted against Canada's national school food program, which helps the most vulnerable families save approximately \$800 per family. She voted against the Canadian dental care plan, which helps at least 10,000 people in her riding of Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis. She voted against investments in the Davie shipyard, which is struggling to recruit the staff it needs. These are good jobs for our people. I hope she will come to her senses and support the government's action.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Feed Ontario hunger report shows that over one million Ontarians went to food banks, for a total of 8.7 million visits, over the last year. That is the highest ever. While Canadians are struggling, the Liberal Prime Minister has handed over billions of dollars to big corporations with zero job guarantees: \$400 million to Algoma and 1,000 jobs lost, and \$15 billion to Stellantis and 3,000 jobs gone.

Why does the Prime Minister always make taxpayers pay for sweetheart corporate deals while Canadians go hungry?

Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, food security experts and poverty elimination companies do a great job advocating directly to government, and what they are saying is that we need more affordable housing. In the last two weeks alone, we have announced 857 new co-op housing units. That is really close to home for me because I am proud to have grown up in co-op housing, unlike some of the Conservatives who like to call it Soviet-style housing or to degrade affordable housing by calling it shacks or something like that.

We are creating more jobs, and we are creating opportunity for Canadians, but every single time we bring a motion forward in the House to provide that care to Canadians, whether it is through child care, dental care or affordable food in schools, the Conservatives vote against it.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, food banks are seeing record demand, while the Prime Minister keeps shovelling taxpayer dollars at multinationals with zero job guarantees. At CAMI, pink slips are hitting kitchen tables, and it is just weeks before Christmas. Families across Middlesex—London are losing their paycheques and cannot afford to buy groceries. The minister said that she would get an update from GM, but it has been 40 days and she has nothing: no plan, no transparency and no jobs.

Why does the Prime Minister keep making Canadians pay the price for his financial incompetence?

[Translation]

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives voted against budget 2025, they voted against old age security and the guaranteed income supplement. They voted against the New Horizons for Seniors program. They voted against a personal support workers tax credit. They voted against dental care for over six million Canadian seniors.

Canadians want to know whom—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Northwest.

* * *

*[English]***NATURAL RESOURCES**

Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been eight months since the Prime Minister was elected, claiming he would build nation-building projects at speeds not seen in generations.

Now we have learned that he has not even started consultations. He could have started these within weeks of the last election, given the existential crisis that he claimed. The Prime Minister's incoming heritage minister said that consultations should have begun yesterday, taking a shot at the Prime Minister, and that one cannot do consultations on a desktop, taking another shot at the natural resources minister, who said they could be done by Zoom.

Has the Prime Minister avoided consultation with first nations because he does not care about them, or because he does not want a pipeline built?

• (1500)

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our relationship with our partners, first nations, Métis, and Inuit rights holders is of utmost importance.

With major projects, consultation and the duty to accommodate will be adhered to. There are no major projects before us right now; there is just an MOU. It is the process that is outlining the conditions to be met. Major projects will require the duty to consult.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal “keep it in the ground” caucus is saying that the MOU with Alberta is not a pipeline approval. There is no project, no route, certainly no consensus, and no private sector proponent.

Now they are conveniently hiding behind the tanker ban, which is preventing us from getting our resources to market. All the while, American tankers are happily sailing right by, from Alaska down to the lower 48.

I have a simple question: Will the Prime Minister lift the tanker ban so we can build a pipeline, or is this just a pipe dream?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in a trade war. It is time to recognize that. Our agreement with Alberta is about a team Canada plan to strengthen our hand and put Canada in a position to win that trade war. We are going to do it by growing exports beyond a single customer and by driving down emissions with strong industrial carbon pricing and a commitment to major decarbonization projects in partnership with jurisdictions and in partnership with first nations.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend important discussions were held in Surrey, British Columbia, on strengthening our law enforcement and intelligence agencies to combat extortion.

Protecting Canadians has never been more critical, yet the Conservatives play political games and stall measures like Bill C-2, preventing law enforcement from getting the key tools they need to protect Canadians.

Can the Minister of Public Safety please outline the steps our government—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister for Public Safety.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells for his hard work.

We are taking real action to fight extortion. Last week we had a summit in Surrey, British Columbia, that brought together the Government of British Columbia, law enforcement and the extortion task force, as well as municipal leaders, in order to ensure that we are all on the same page and are fighting this fight together.

Unfortunately the Conservatives continue to play games. They are opposing critical bills that would strengthen law enforcement. I urge the Conservative Party to come on board and support—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon West.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the new Minister of Culture was the immigration minister, he said, “I don’t see a world in which we lower [immigration targets]... Whether we revise them upwards or not is something that I have to look at. But certainly I don’t think [we will]...lower them”. Then in 2024 he made history by allowing nearly 500,000 permanent residents into the country, the highest number ever in a single year.

Today we are in a national housing crisis, emergency rooms are overflowing, and we are in a youth jobs crisis.

How does the current immigration minister feel about holding the bag for a Trudeau-era guy who just got promoted for making a big mess?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We are going to have to let some time go by, because everyone is getting very excited every time the secretary of state stands up.

The Secretary of State for Rural Development.

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Saskatchewan Conservative caucus that 14 of them were elected over a period of 10 years. That is 140 collective years that we have had Conservative representation from Saskatchewan.

What have they accomplished in those 10 years on housing, on trade and on infrastructure? They have accomplished nothing.

• (1505)

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is quite the indictment when the Liberals do not even let the immigration minister answer a question about immigration. In a CBC interview when he was the immigration minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The member for Calgary Nose Hill.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, in a CBC interview when he was the immigration minister, the new minister of culture dismissed premiers' pleas for support for a flood of Liberal-enabled fraudulent asylum claims by saying, “I think what they're [the premiers are] advancing...is a complete crock of [bleep].” In reality, he oversaw billions of dollars going to house bogus asylum claimants while emergency rooms overflowed.

My question is this: If the failed former immigration minister can get a promotion, does this mean that the current Prime Minister will promote the current immigration minister too?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me thank the colleague and member for placing her confidence in me and in the government.

Let me tell you one thing: Canadians elected the government with a big mandate. We have brought in a generational budget that includes a sustainable immigration plan, one that will deal with permanent immigration as well as temporary immigration, and bring global talent.

Why do the member and her party keep obstructing every single time? Get on board.

The Speaker: Members should address their comments through the Chair.

The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2022 a Jamaican national was convicted in the United States of an aggravated felony of sexual abuse of a minor, but in 2023 the Liberals welcomed him to Canada. Worse, they allowed him to claim asylum, and today that child sexual abuser is still in Canada. The Liberals voted against Conservative measures to prevent non-citizen child sexual abusers from entering Canada, abusing our immigration system and avoiding deportation.

Why are the Liberals protecting non-citizen child sexual abusers? Why did they not support our policies?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a robust system of inadmissibility that ensures that people who were not eligible to be here will be removed. This year we are on target to remove over 20,000 people who are ineligible to be here, including those with criminal offences.

Let me be very clear that the sanctimony of members of the party opposite that they put forward on issues of public safety needs to be checked when they oppose the very tools that public safety officers need to do their job effectively.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been 19 years since the First Nations Fiscal Management Act came into force, thanks to the leadership and determination of first nations across Canada. Since then, the act has evolved into a highly successful and robust system that supports first nations with fiscal management, local taxation and access to pooled borrowing.

Can the minister update the House on the important work under way to advance indigenous economic prosperity?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 proposes important updates to the First Nations Fiscal Management Act that will enable the First Nations Finance Authority to lend to special-purpose vehicles. For indigenous communities, this makes it easier for multiple nations to work together, borrow as a group and lower administrative costs. It also provides access to better borrowing rates and more opportunities to take equity in major projects and infrastructure.

With improved access to financing, communities can create good jobs, grow local businesses and build lasting prosperity for future generations.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that this member was picked to be the new Minister responsible for Official Languages. This morning, this member repeated that he is fed up with defending the decline of French. I have news for him. We in the Conservative Party of Canada will fight for francophones across Canada. Even the Premier of Quebec is saying that it is shameful that this person was appointed as the Minister responsible for Official Languages.

Is the new Quebec lieutenant also fed up with debating the decline of French, as his colleague, the Minister of Canadian Heritage, says he is?

• (1510)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, French actually is in decline across Canada. However, what bothers me is the hypocrisy of the Conservatives, who voted against our plan to invest \$4.1 billion across Canada in order to strengthen French in our country. As the Minister of Immigration, I

doubled francophone immigration outside Quebec. That is a great result, even if the Conservatives voted against our \$4.1-billion plan.

What is shameful is their hypocrisy.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): Uqaqtitiji, living downstream from the oil sands, the Mikisew Cree First Nation has higher rates of cancer, yet the government is developing regulations to allow affected water to be released into the Athabasca River. UNDRIP and the environmental racism act must be implemented to protect the health of first nations.

How can the Liberals proceed with regulations knowing that the Mikisew Cree First Nation has not given consent because its residents are dying from cancer?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pollution from the oil sands tailings ponds is a serious issue, and we acknowledge and take seriously the concerns raised by nearby indigenous communities in the region. We are currently supporting a study of health impacts on nearby communities, and there is a Crown-indigenous working group working on water release standards. We are committed to protecting Canada's environment and the health of communities and, of course, the indigenous communities nearby.

* * *

HEALTH

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, our health care system is already stretched, yet the federal government piles on needless work. The College of Family Physicians warns that the disability tax credit form is worsening the strain and costing patients access to care. Instead of fixing it, budget 2025 allocates \$10 million to help people navigate the same broken system.

Provinces already determine disability eligibility. Why will the minister not automatically accept provincial approval for the disability tax credit to reduce barriers and let family doctors focus on patient care?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is historic. For the first time in this country, we have a disability tax benefit, and I want to thank all parliamentarians who supported this. Unfortunately, again the Conservatives voted against the very people they say they wish to help.

Government Orders

Budget 2025 actually goes a step further, and it compensates people for the financial burden of getting doctors' forms to file for their credit. We will continue to work with people who are living with disabilities to make sure that they have every opportunity to thrive in Canadian society.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS PROCEDURE AND PRACTICE

The Speaker: It is my pleasure to lay before the House, in both official languages, the fourth edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

As many hon. members know, the first three editions were respectively published in 2000, 2009 and 2017. Each of these additions quickly became an essential reference not only for those who work on Parliament Hill, but also for those off the Hill who have an interest in the House of Commons.

I am confident that this fourth edition will in turn soon establish itself as the most authoritative source of procedural guidance for our parliamentary proceedings.

This new edition, edited by the Clerk of the House, Eric Janse, and the deputy clerk, procedure, Jeffrey LeBlanc, reflects the most current practices and procedures. Spanning more than 1,300 pages and containing over 5,500 footnotes, it reflects the depth and complexity of the House's procedural framework.

Members will be interested to know that the fourth edition reflects our rules and practices as recent as the spring of 2025.

• (1515)

[*Translation*]

For the ease and convenience of all, the fourth edition is also available in an accessible electronic format on the House of Commons website.

I would like to express my gratitude to the many dedicated individuals from across the administration who played a role in the drafting, editing, design and publication of this book. The entire production process was a remarkable team effort, reflecting the outstanding professionalism and expertise of House employees.

I encourage all members not only to refer to this publication, but to make it a vital resource in strengthening their understanding of the procedural knowledge essential to their parliamentary duties. While it may not qualify as light reading, I am confident that you will find it both highly informative and immensely valuable.

I invite all members to join me in the Speaker's salon for a reception to mark this very special occasion.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Par-

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

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to again rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Where I parted ways with my speech was when I was talking about things that people in my riding and communities in my riding had asked for. For instance, one of the things I wrote to the finance minister about, which I do not believe was addressed, as none of these things were addressed, was the Village of Clinton struggling with housing. Imagine that. The government tells us about how much it is building, yet the Village of Clinton continues to struggle with housing. Where is its support? It is absolutely non-existent.

What about consultations for the Village of Ashcroft? Ashcroft has critical infrastructure challenges. The community serves a number of outlying areas in addition to the community itself, and the collective tax base cannot cover critical infrastructure. The village needs upgrades to the sewer plant and water reservoir for a sustainable future. I wrote to the Minister of Justice on this. We will see. It looks like crickets so far.

The Thompson-Nicola Regional District has a number of needs, especially when it comes to housing. There is also water and wastewater infrastructure for rural communities, which is central to building houses, and the government is silent. There is emergency preparedness and ongoing streamlined funding to support emergency operations, fire halls and things like that. We do not see smaller communities being supported in this budget.

The First Nations' Emergency Services Society of British Columbia also put something forward. I have not heard back on that one.

What about Merritt? I was overwhelmed to be in Merritt recently. The government promised money to Merritt for the flooding and the dikes. It got none. The province contributed. The federal government was there for the photo ops. It has done nothing.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about talk and no action, let us look at the Conservative Party's filibuster and refusal to pass legislation. We have bail reform legislation, as an example, which was an election platform promise, and the Conservatives continue to stall the passage of that bill. We have Bill C-15. They will not even pass it to go to committee. This is an opposition party that is bent on being a destructive force on the floor of the House of Commons.

Government Orders

The Conservatives should be ashamed of themselves. I would ask this: When are they going to get off their back end and start allowing legislation to get through the House of Commons?

• (1520)

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, I see so many Liberal backbenchers who are not allowed to speak because this member wants to make baseless accusations. Why is another member not standing up right now?

The community of Merritt was promised money for the flooding. All these Liberals talk about is how they are going to have our backs. The Prime Minister and cabinet ministers went to British Columbia and said they would have its back. They did nothing. This member can stand up here while backbenchers after backbenchers get to say nothing. Where was he for the community of Merritt? Where were these Liberals for the community of Merritt? Where are they for Canadians when they need them most?

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech, and I would like to hear what he has to say about the record deficit that the current Liberal government is forcing on us. The member says that this an intergenerational budget, but I would say it is more of an intergenerational disaster. We are talking about a \$78-billion deficit. Justin Trudeau seems positively frugal compared to the current Prime Minister, the expert banker, who is driving us further into deficit.

There is another equally serious matter: The member is saying that \$45 billion of the \$78 billion is investment. According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, the way the government put this budget together with this creative new accounting means that these are not real investments, and that means that we are not being told the real truth about the budget.

I would like my colleague to tell me what he thinks about this deficit and how the government is using creative accounting to its advantage.

[*English*]

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly. We do not always agree with the Bloc, but I agree wholeheartedly. This is not a generational budget. This is generational spending, where \$5,400 is being added for every single family. That is how much our deficit is. This is why people are getting rich. Certain people are getting rich: consultants, Brookfield shareholders and probably a few others. There are people who are lined up at food banks in my riding in record numbers. I agree with that member.

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to have previously represented many of the regions this member now represents in the Fraser Canyon. Indeed, in 2021, the federal government promised billions of dollars to help rebuild British Columbia. The government talked about the impacts of climate change. We have seen them more specifically than any other region of Canada.

Why does the government not believe in climate change, and why does it keep talking about trying to address climate change but

will not actually do it where we have seen the biggest impact in Canada?

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, there is a really quick reason for this. This government is all talk, no rock.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, coastal communities are running out of time. Key federal programs that protect wild salmon and restore critical habitat expire in March, and they were not in the budget. The federal government has not confirmed their renewal, and communities cannot wait for a spring economic statement. On the west coast, wild salmon are vital for food security, culture, the ecosystem and the economy. First nations, hatcheries and restoration groups are doing the work, but they cannot plan without federal certainty. It is essential that we do not take our foot off the gas.

Does my colleague agree with how critical these programs are and that it is critical the federal government fund these programs and restore funding immediately?

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, I actually wrapped up my colleague from Mission's answer very quickly, because I wanted to hear from my colleague for whom I have a great deal of time.

I am by no means an expert on fisheries, but I do have 29 first nations in my riding. I understand the importance of fishing, particularly when it comes to economies on the island, and first nations economies at that. From what I have seen, I have seen a government that has been unserious on this file based on its rhetoric, but also based on who it is appointing. I could go on, but I hope to talk to my colleague more in the future.

Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to thank my constituents of Niagara West for putting their trust in me to be their voice here in Ottawa. It is an honour and a privilege to serve them. I have been their representative in this place since 2004, and I will continue to tirelessly fight for their interests every single day.

Unfortunately, the Liberal government, through 10 consecutive budgets, is working against the interests of my constituents. In fact, I believe it is working against the interests of Canadians in general. The Liberal track record under Justin Trudeau was abysmal, and it is the same bunch running things again for the new Prime Minister, so it is no surprise then that things are actually getting worse.

Let us not forget that the Prime Minister was Justin Trudeau's economic adviser since 2020. Many issues have gotten exponentially worse since he took office in April of this year. He promised he would fix things. Well, he has not done much fixing, but he sure is travelling a lot. He has circled the planet four times over with spectacularly bad results. In fact, he has done nothing but burn jet fuel and contribute to global greenhouse gas emissions.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister first promised he would have a deal done with the United States by July 21, and then he changed it to August 1. He has travelled there a few times, so where is the deal? Today is December 2, and there is no deal and none being worked on as we speak. Things are so bad on the negotiation front that every time the Prime Minister goes somewhere, including the United States, somehow Canadians end up paying more tariffs.

It is one failure after another, but if we listen to the Liberals talk in this place, they would say that Canadians have never had it so good. Sometimes I think they live in an alternative universe. They even say that we are imagining the taxes we are paying on food and fuel. All people have to do is watch question period and they will hear it for themselves. The rhetoric does not match the facts on the ground. That is what the most frustrating part is for Canadians.

Hard-working Canadians are losing their jobs on a daily basis. Let us recap a few here. Stellantis announced that 3,000 Canadian jobs will head south to Illinois. A week later, General Motors said that it is ending electrical van production at the CAMI assembly plant, putting 1,200 people out of work at their Ingersoll plant. Quebec truck manufacturer Paccar was forced to lay off 300 workers because of additional American tariffs on commercial trucks, bringing the total job cuts to 725 in their Sainte-Thérèse plant. These followed TFT Global laying off 425 workers in Oshawa, and Magna cutting 49 jobs in London. In Ear Falls, 150 union workers were laid off when the town's sawmill shut down. One hundred and fifty workers were laid off by Western Forest Products in B.C. and 150 more workers from Interfor's Ontario plants. Just yesterday, we found out that Algoma Steel will let go of 1,000 workers.

All these people have families, mortgages, bills and kids to take care of. These folks are now wondering what is next and what is going to happen to their futures. Does the Prime Minister care? That is debatable.

Recently, the Prime Minister said that he did not care about the U.S. negotiations that led to the layoffs I just mentioned. When asked about the trade talks, the Prime Minister responded with a smug, "Who cares?" and that he did not "have a burning issue to speak with the president about right now," while Canadian families and businesses are suffering. Let us not forget that he is the one who promised to negotiate a win and to handle Donald Trump.

Canadians are still waiting while things are getting worse and worse. The Liberal deficit this year is nearly \$80 billion. The national debt is a staggering \$1.3 trillion. Let us put it this way: For each individual watching at home today, and for every Canadian, their portion is \$33,000. That is every single Canadian's debt to pay back. When I say every single Canadian, I mean from newborn infants to seniors in long-term care facilities. It is everyone. They owe \$33,000 and this amount is only getting bigger.

Why is it getting bigger? The interest payment alone is about \$60 billion a year as these deficits continue year after year. It is what experts call an economic ticking time bomb. An analyst at Reuters warned that the deficit trajectory risks undermining confidence in Canada's long-term financial stability. Let me translate that so that my Liberal colleagues can understand. The Reuters analyst basically said that Liberals are managing this country like a teenager handles their first Visa card: buy now, cry later.

We all know the current slogan, in essence, is the same as Justin Trudeau's. The Prime Minister's "we are spending less and investing more" slogan is just Justin Trudeau's "the budget will balance itself" nonsense.

● (1525)

What do they have to show for all these deficits they have been running for last 10 years? As expected, it is nothing but terrible results. We are seeing depression, hunger, homelessness, addiction and crime. We have an affordability crisis the likes of which we have not seen in generations. Young folks cannot buy homes. They are delaying starting families. They are living in their parents' basements and they do not see a way out. We have a 7% unemployment rate overall. It is double for young people. What about attracting investment to Canada? There is not much there either. Business investment is cratering. For folks listening at home, when businesses decide not to invest in Canada, it means that jobs are not being created in Canada.

Like I have been saying for many years, Liberal red tape and over-regulation are choking the life out of Canadian businesses and foreign investment. Business confidence in Canada is already at low and near recessive levels, according to multiple surveys.

Do not worry, the Liberals have a plan, which is to cross their fingers, close their eyes and whisper manifesting affirmations. RBC politely described the Liberals' expectations for their budget as overly optimistic. Let us translate this too. A banker is basically saying that these people are dreaming.

What about the Liberal record on affordability? I think that everyone at this point knows that the Liberal out-of-control spending and taxation have caused hunger, poverty and homelessness in our society. The average household pays 41% more in income taxes in 2023 than in 2010. Let me say that again, because most Canadians will be shocked to hear this. The average household paid 41% more income taxes in 2023 than in 2010. I wonder who was in government then.

Government Orders

More than one in four Canadians needed to use savings or borrow money to buy food. More than one in four is experiencing food insecurity. The average family of four will spend over \$800 more this year on groceries compared to last. We are seeing food bank lineups reminiscent of bread lines in communist regimes. Food bank visits are at an all-time high. More than a million people visited the food bank in the past year. In Ontario, one out of every 16 people has gone to a food bank because they cannot afford to eat. That is 24,000 people across the province every single day. It is a staggering 87% increase compared to 2020.

How anyone can think they are doing a good job given these statistics is astonishing to me. Food banks across the country are at a breaking point. That is the record of the Liberal Party of Canada for the last 10 years. That is the record that they are somehow proud of.

The policies they have chosen to implement, like taxing people into poverty, inflationary spending that makes people's paycheques worth less and over-regulating businesses into bankruptcy, or worse than that, out of the country, are their record. That is what they have been able to achieve. All the while, they are getting cozier with foreign hostile powers like China, when the Liberals are fully aware that Beijing has been involved in espionage and interfering in Canada's elections.

How many examples of Beijing interference in Canada do the Liberals need to understand that Beijing is Canada's adversary, not a friend? The Liberals have barely addressed the Winnipeg lab situation, where two so-called scientists were fired from the lab because they were working in Beijing's interests.

All of that said, this is really what Canada has become. It is what this generation will be known for: an affordability crisis, a housing crisis, a foreign affairs crisis, a trade crisis and many other crises, probably, the way things are going.

There is hope at the end of the tunnel. Canadians can rest assured that with a Conservative government, this type of devastation directly caused by Liberals will be fixed. It will be fixed with common-sense ideas and policies that put Canadian families at the centre. Canadians want lower taxes, affordable food and homes, and an overall life that is a safe life. They want a future for our children that involves being able to have a family in a home on a safe street and pride in who we are as Canadians. Our Conservative plan is one of pragmatism.

It is time for the Liberals to admit that they have failed spectacularly in the last 10 years. As our Conservative leader has said repeatedly, please copy our plan. We talk about it in this place all the time. We have laid it out online for people to read, including Liberal MPs from across the aisle.

Canadians are desperate for a change in direction. I think all of us in this place want what is best for Canadians. I truly do. Let us make this happen. Let us work together toward a future that Canadians can be proud of. The budget, as it currently stands, is simply not it. That is why I just cannot support the budget and why I will be voting against it.

• (1530)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member says to work together. He makes reference to having safe streets. On the other hand, there was an election platform from the Prime Minister to bring forward bail reform legislation. The Conservatives have done anything but be co-operative on the legislation. This is legislation that should have passed by now. Canadians deserve bail reform legislation. This is legislation that provinces, law enforcement officers, stakeholders and Canadians want. The roadblock is the Conservative Party of Canada.

Regarding the budget debate, once again, Conservatives want to continue to debate and debate instead of allowing the bill to go to committee. The only thing that the Conservative Party has been able to demonstrate in the last number of weeks is that they know how to continue to be a destructive force on the floor of the House of Commons.

Does the Conservative Party have an ounce of shame to recognize that what they are doing does not serve the best interests of Canadians?

• (1535)

Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, our job as the opposition is to make bills better. There are a number of bills that have come through us. We are talking about the budget right now, but we can talk about Bill C-8, Bill C-9 and a number of other bills that, quite frankly, are not in the best interest of Canadians.

Our job as parliamentarians is to make those bills better. I have no problem at all trying to do that. We were elected to represent our constituents, point out the flaws in these bills and try to make them better. That is what we will do. This is our job. This is our requirement. This is what we will continue to do.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the budget, the government uses a definition of investment that does not exist anywhere else in the world. In committee, we pointed out that aspect of Bill C-15. The member for Whitby, who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, was unable to say where else in the world that definition is used. In the middle of the committee meeting, he consulted ChatGPT. He asked ChatGPT the question. It made a series of mistakes and the member misled the committee because of these mistakes made by ChatGPT. The member was trying to find a single place in the world where the government's definition of investment had been used.

They were mistakes. Canada is the only country that uses this definition. The parliamentary secretary was forced to base his responses and interactions with the parliamentary committee on mistakes made by ChatGPT. I would like my colleague to tell me what this tells us about the seriousness and level of preparation of the Department of Finance and the parliamentary secretary.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Bloc raises an excellent point. Nowhere have we ever seen what the government is trying to do. Really, what it is trying to do is con Canadians. This is what it is trying to do.

The government is trying to explain to Canadians that, somehow, we have two separate categories, operations and investment, when at the end of the day, parliaments from around the world look at spending as just one thing, as the member so aptly pointed out. It is one bucket. We can call it operations. We can call it marketing. We can call it investments, whatever we want to call it.

The reality is that the government spends money. Money comes in in the form of taxes, and then what happens at the end of the day is that governments are responsible for then redistributing that money. The member makes an excellent point. No matter how we spend it, it is still spending.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague what he thinks of all of the job losses we are seeing in Ontario right now. We are weeks before Christmas. We have CAMI handing pink slips to people in southwestern Ontario. We have other job losses in the auto sector across southwestern Ontario. I know Middlesex—London, and all of southwestern Ontario, is being hit hard by these job losses.

I would like to ask my colleague what we would do, what he would do, as Conservatives, to help with these job losses, and why he thinks the Liberal government does not seem to care about our workers in Ontario.

Dean Allison: Mr. Speaker, that is a great question. I really believe it is a dereliction of duty of the Prime Minister and the government. It is absolutely unconscionable that it is walking away from our largest trading partner, the most important trading partner, and saying, “Who cares?”

They do not really think about it. They are not really concerned about the automotive industry, and then they are shocked when they have all these additional tariffs because they will not sit down to actually negotiate. They are shocked when they spend all their time making fun of other world leaders and somehow think this is not going to affect our relationships in any way. It was disastrous under Justin Trudeau because of how incompetent he was in trying to represent us, but now, for the government to continue along the same vein, is absolutely unconscionable.

I feel sorry. I feel sad, and I feel very disappointed for all these workers who are going to suffer.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Riding Mountain, Finance; the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, Public Safety; the hon. member for Langley Township—Fraser Heights, The Economy.

• (1540)

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we need to be frank and clear-eyed. Instead of tabling its budget last

spring after the election, the Liberal government chose to table it this fall. Why? It simply was not ready back then.

This budget clearly reveals the new Prime Minister's policy orientation: a big deficit and Conservative policies. Let us look at the facts. Two measures dominate this budget: massive military spending and the tax cuts announced last spring. The government plans to spend billions on defence to satisfy Donald Trump's demands even as it slashes foreign aid. That is the order of priority: weapons before solidarity, submission before co-operation.

This record \$78-billion deficit makes Justin Trudeau look positively frugal, and that is saying something. That deficit will be achieved only if the public service sheds 40,000 jobs in four years.

Where is the plan? Where is the vision? They are nowhere to be found. This is not reform; it is a threat.

The step backward on the environment is tragic. Green policies have been abolished. The oil and gas industry is getting maximum support, so much so that the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture disagreed and opted to resign. That is the price for defending the planet in this government: isolation, silence, or exit. For now, the former minister is still a Liberal member. How he handles his options remains to be seen.

While the Prime Minister was elected on a promise to stand up to Trump and protect our businesses and workers impacted by the tariff crisis, this budget contains a few paltry support measures.

In terms of reforming the EI system to make it more accessible and functional, we will have to keep waiting. Only a few temporary measures have been extended. That is the reality.

The budget contains the support that was announced in August for the forestry industry, with \$700 million in loan guarantees, but this measure is still not accessible. Only one forestry company in Quebec has accessed it so far. While we acknowledge this measure was recently enhanced, we strongly disagree with the fact that it is not accessible four months after it was announced, four long months for workers at Scierie St-Michel who are still waiting for this assistance.

The budget includes an investment superdeduction for businesses. That is all well and good, but it is not enough given the tariff crisis.

The government claims this is a generational budget, but there is only \$9 billion in new money over five years for infrastructure, \$9 billion for the whole of Canada. That is barely twice the amount needed to refurbish a hospital in Montreal. In the meantime, our roads, our water systems and our overall infrastructure needs will have to wait. Wait for what? Wait for a government that actually believes in the future.

Government Orders

The health sector is getting worse, with a 3% increase in health transfers, even though costs have gone up by 6%. This harkens back to Stephen Harper's government. The federal share will continue to decrease steadily, along with access to health care. That is the dollars and cents approach that is compromising social justice.

When it comes to housing, in his budget, the Prime Minister has reiterated his commitment to Build Canada Homes to tackle the housing shortage but has not given any details about this plan, other than expressing a desire to centralize this area, which should be a Quebec and provincial jurisdiction. There will be significant delays of several years before approved funds can be spent. In the meantime, families and individuals are still waiting for housing.

For provinces that did not have a carbon pricing system, which is all of them except for Quebec and British Columbia, the federal government implemented a carbon tax that was offset by cheques sent to households. During the election campaign, the Liberals abolished the tax but still sent a cheque to the residents of every province except Quebec and British Columbia. This was a handout to those taxpayers that cost Quebec taxpayers \$814 million. The government still refuses to compensate us for that. With this Prime Minister, the environmental laggards are rewarded by the people who are actually making an effort.

Added to that is the government's stubborn refusal to reimburse Quebec for the assistance provided to refugee claimants, leaving us on the hook for \$700 million. That is how they treat a compassionate nation.

The budget confirms that the tax on web giants has been scrapped. As the big five tech giants use tax havens to pay almost no tax here and elsewhere, Canada had passed the legislation suggested by the OECD consisting of a tax equal to 3% of revenue earned in Canada. Donald Trump and his billionaire tech friends did not like this tax, so in June, the Prime Minister decided to repeal it in order to negotiate an agreement with Trump by July 21, 2025. No trade agreement was ultimately reached, but the budget confirms the commitment to amend the law so that web giants will no longer be taxed. Billion-dollar multinationals can once again shirk their fiscal responsibilities. What is even more upsetting is that we in the Bloc Québécois have been advocating for many years to use part of this tax to support media that are struggling financially as a result of advertisers shifting their business to digital platforms.

• (1545)

The budget contains increased funding for CBC/Radio-Canada, but it does not allocate anything to other media. The government expects them to fend for themselves.

There is a new setback when it comes to tax havens. Canada is abandoning the 15% global minimum tax on U.S.-based businesses. Members will recall that Canada announced this tax with its G7 partners during the summit held in western Canada in June. That is another significant setback in the fight against the use of tax havens, which also stemmed from agreements with the OECD, or the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

That is another capitulation. Who does this benefit? Brookfield, a company that was headed by the Prime Minister before he joined

politics less than a year ago. Brookfield, which moved its headquarters to New York for tax reasons. Brookfield manages many subsidiaries in tax havens. Some of the subsidiaries that operate in Canada even received funding through the wage subsidy program during the pandemic even though they report income in tax havens to avoid paying taxes in Canada. That is the moral of this government: the powerful take and Canadians pay.

The Liberals have a minority government, but with this budget and other initiatives introduced in the House, they are behaving as if they have a majority government. They did not negotiate any agreement to secure support from any party and chose to conduct themselves like cowboys. They banked on the fact that people were wary of an election during the holidays to advance their political agenda. The Bloc Québécois remained true to its principles and made its budget requests. All of these requests were ignored. In our opinion, the budget will hurt Quebecers and so we voted against it, while all the other opposition parties chose to let it pass.

The Green Party member initially stomped on the budget in front of cameras because it did not contain anything for the environment but ultimately chose to support it. There were two NDP abstentions, which gave the Liberals a majority, even though this was a Conservative budget that will result in massive cuts of 40,000 public service jobs over four years. Lastly, the Conservatives used a strategy that allowed them to vote after everyone else to ensure that the budget passed. The House leader and the caucus chair walked into the House of Commons after the vote, before the results were released, claiming that they had experienced technical difficulties voting remotely. They play acted and voted after the fact. It was all a sham.

We do not accept this government's vision. We do not accept bowing to the powerful, pandering to billionaires, abandoning workers, treating the provinces with contempt, and stepping back on the environment. We do not accept centralization, arrogance and injustice. We want respect for Quebec. We want to continue to fight against the use of tax havens. We want to support our media, and we want to protect workers. We want adequate funding for health care. When it comes to Donald Trump, we want fairness and dignity. That is our fight, that is our duty. We are going to fight with all our might, because we know that history belongs to those who refuse to back down.

The Bloc Québécois will not support Bill C-15. It is an enormous omnibus bill nearly 650 pages long. It contains 80 legislative measures that create or amend 49 laws in a wide range of areas. Some are quite good, others are simply minor legislative amendments. In addition to containing almost none of the Bloc Québécois's pre-budget priorities, Bill C-15 includes certain measures that we find utterly unacceptable.

Government Orders

For example, it includes billions of dollars in new fossil fuel subsidies. It deepens the media crisis and permanently scraps the digital services tax. Lastly, I must condemn the amendment the government hid in the middle of its omnibus bill, which gives any minister the power to exempt any company from the application of any federal law, except the Criminal Code, for a period of three years. This is completely unacceptable. That is why we will be voting against Bill C-15.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague very well knows, housing and the cost of living are the main issues of concern for Quebeckers. Our government is putting forward a well-thought-out plan with investments that will double the rate of home construction, including the construction of affordable housing. Also in the plan are investments in infrastructure, particularly health infrastructure, and investments to modernize the construction industry. It also includes a buy Canadian policy to support the steel and lumber industries, and workers in our lumber industry.

How can my colleague, in all conscience, vote against a budget that helps Quebeckers by meeting their needs and their expectations?

• (1550)

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for her question. I have the pleasure of working with her on housing needs.

I would invite her to go back and read the report that the Parliamentary Budget Officer released this morning. The report says that basically, what has been presented so far regarding Build Canada Homes shows that it is an empty shell and will do nothing to meet the targets. That worries us. Neither the budget nor Bill C-15 provides any details on Build Canada Homes, and this is cause for concern.

Once again, we applaud the fine words, but we are concerned that this will not translate into concrete action. My experience in the House over the last decade has taught me that when money is announced and voted on, it can take years for it to be released. I am really worried about that right now.

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague quite rightly referred to the report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, an independent officer of Parliament, which says that the federal government's programs will enable it to meet only 2% to 3% of its targets.

Last week, during a Standing Committee on Finance hearing, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and member for Whitby decided to filibuster right in the middle of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's testimony.

The Liberals are so averse to facts, averse to science and averse to serious figures that the parliamentary secretary to the minister decided to silence an officer of Parliament in the middle of a Standing Committee on Finance meeting.

I would really like my colleague to share his thoughts on this type of behaviour from the government.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Mirabel for his remarks.

This is obviously troubling and very worrisome for the health of democracy.

Earlier, I pointed out that this is a minority government. Normally, a minority government tries to talk to the other parties in order to build a majority in the House and to move bills and the legislative agenda forward. What we have here is a government that does not do that and instead acts like a lone cowboy.

Independent voices are saying that its accounting method of calling expenditures investments does not hold water. This worries the government, because it does not fit its narrative. It is very concerning and unfortunate to see a government member muzzle one of those voices.

We need democracy. Just because there are countries in the world, such as our neighbours to the south, where authoritarianism is on the rise does not mean that we should be heading in that direction as well.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member actually read the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, because the number mentioned was actually 86,000. We are talking about affordable housing. Build Canada Homes is focused on affordable housing. There are all sorts of other incentives that will support construction across the country, but what we are actually talking about here is affordable housing.

I would like my colleague to tell us whether he actually read the report.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, what I take away from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report is that this will not meet the needs in housing.

I acknowledge that the parliamentary secretary is talking about affordable housing. I would like us to talk more about social housing or non-market housing. In the past few years, we have seen that when the government introduces programs for affordable housing, the funding is often earmarked for housing that is not affordable. I find the solutions being considered by the government to ensure that housing is truly affordable interesting, but it is definitely time to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

We look forward to getting more details about this project.

[English]

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of London—Fanshawe to speak to Bill C-15. The budget implementation bill seeks to carry out a narrowly passed budget that the Liberal government tried to sell as a generational investment bill. In reality it is a generational debt that will leave young people with higher costs, fewer opportunities and a heavier financial burden for years to come.

Government Orders

In my community, people are not talking about capital classification or fiscal modelling; they are talking about everyday life. They are talking about how hard it has become to make a paycheque last. They are talking about standing in the grocery aisle hoping that the total stays below what is left in their account and trying to decide what has to go back on the shelf. They are also talking about the reality facing young people in our region, where youth unemployment is at levels that have not been seen in years.

Families worry that their kids will not have the opportunities they had, and young people worry that they are starting behind and falling further behind every month. This is where the budget lands, right in the middle of family budgets already stretched to the breaking point.

The government would like Canadians to believe its accounting changes are just technical adjustments, but they are not. The government redefined capital spending, but not because it discovered a new economic insight; it redefined it by dressing up spending as an investment, and when budgets are dressed up instead of disciplined, Canadians end up paying more. When fiscal anchors are abandoned or quietly replaced, the result is not an academic debate; it is higher debt, higher interest costs and higher prices for the families I represent. These details matter because they help explain why life keeps getting more expensive for people in communities like London—Fanshawe.

The independent Parliamentary Budget Officer exposed what the government tried to hide: By expanding the definition of capital spending far beyond international standards, the government counted corporate subsidies and tax breaks as investment. However, when the Parliamentary Budget Officer applied the proper definition, the supposed capital investment dropped by \$94 billion. That is not a small discrepancy; it is a massive credibility gap, and it tells Canadians that the government is not being straight with them.

We are also hearing these concerns from leaders in the Canadian tech sector. Tobi Lütke, founder and CEO of Shopify, one of Canada's most successful technology companies, recently warned that taxpayer-funded subsidies for foreign branch offices do not strengthen Canada's economy at all. He says that these subsidies lower the cost basis for foreign firms and are "toxic" to our tech economy because the "fruits of the subsidized labour will accrue to the wealth of other countries and not Canada."

When the government pours money into subsidies that distort markets instead of strengthening our own economic foundations, Canadians pay twice, once through their taxes and again through lost opportunity. It gets worse. Even with those redefined numbers, the government will not balance its operating budget over the next five years. Its previous fiscal anchor is gone. Its new one, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, has only a 7.5% chance of being met.

That is not a plan; it is wishful thinking backed by borrowed money, and borrowed money has consequences. This year's deficit is \$78 billion, \$16 billion more than the government promised, and double what its predecessor delivered. Next year, interest on the debt will hit \$55.6 billion. That is more than the government will transfer to provinces for health care, and it is comparable to all the GST revenue Canadians pay. Every dollar of GST essentially goes

to servicing debt, not to supporting Canadians or providing essential services.

The massive debt burden reflects only what has already been spent and accumulated in the past. It does not account for the future spending pressures the government continues to create with out-of-control budgets like the current one. With no credible plan to rein in costs or restore discipline, there is every indication that this number will keep growing year after year. The debt load Canadians are carrying today is only the beginning. Without a change in direction, it will continue to rise, pushing more of every tax dollar away from the services Canadians rely on and into interest payments on past decisions.

This is not fiscal responsibility; it is the cost of a decade of over-spending: a decade of pushing the envelope further and further rather than showing restraint, and a decade of ignoring long-term consequences while digging future generations deeper into debt. The Prime Minister has nearly doubled the deficit left by his predecessor.

● (1555)

Nothing in this budget suggests that the government has learned from its mistakes or intends to take long-term economic stability seriously. The consequences of that failure will not be paid by the people making these decisions today but by young Canadians who will carry this weight for years to come. Families in London—Fanshawe cannot absorb any more of these costs, and they should not have to.

Not long ago, a young man told me something that stayed with me. He said that he has stopped thinking about buying a home in the usual way. Instead of planning, saving and building toward that goal, he now feels that his only realistic path to home ownership is to one day inherit his parents' house. He said it not out of impatience but out of genuine discouragement. He works hard, he saves what he can and he still feels like he is running up a down escalator.

That is what a decade of rising prices and falling opportunity has done to an entire generation. This budget does not fix that. It keeps the industrial carbon tax in place, the very tax that makes construction materials more expensive and drives up the cost of building homes across this country.

For years the Liberal government championed the failed consumer carbon tax. Canadians rejected it; they made it clear they wanted nothing to do with it. The new Prime Minister arrived, promising change, but instead of listening, his status quo government simply shifted the same costs out of sight. They call it industrial pricing, but it is the same agenda of making everything more expensive, only hidden further up the supply chain.

Government Orders

Families still pay the costs through higher grocery bills, higher homebuilding costs and higher prices on nearly everything they need. It is carbon tax 2.0 dressed up as a responsible policy, and it continues to punish the very people who can least afford it.

This budget does not fix that. It keeps the industrial tax on construction materials, making homes more expensive to build. It backs away from the government's own promise to help municipalities cut development charges, even though those charges can add tens of thousands of dollars to the cost of a home. If a government wants more housing built, it should not make building it more expensive, and if a government wants to restore the Canadian promise of home ownership, it should not raise costs at every step of the process.

This budget also falls short on the most basic measure of public policy: Does it make life more affordable? The answer is no. Food bank usage is at record highs. Housing costs are the highest in the G7. Investment is collapsing. Families are doing everything right by working, saving and budgeting, yet they are somehow falling behind. This budget was supposed to help; instead it pours fuel on the fire.

Conservatives are not here simply to say no. We offered a constructive alternative. During second reading, our caucus introduced a reasoned amendment that would move Canada toward an affordable life by ending the industrial carbon tax, cutting wasteful spending, bringing down debt and inflation, unlocking our energy potential and clearing away the red tape slowing homebuilding across this country.

We believe that Canadians deserve a hopeful future, one where young people can own a home, where seniors can live with dignity and where every person who works hard can get ahead. This budget implementation bill would not deliver that future. It would deliver higher costs, higher debt and a heavier burden on the next generation.

Conservatives will continue fighting for an affordable life and a hopeful future for every person in this country.

• (1600)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again the Conservatives are recognizing that their most productive role in the chamber seems to be preventing legislation from passing from stage to stage. They ultimately argue that we should all be able to speak indefinitely to the legislation.

Good examples of that are Bill C-14, the bail reform legislation, or Bill C-2. The legislation, particularly on bail reform, was legislation that was in the election platform. Even though all Canadians, provinces and law enforcement officers want this, why does the Conservative Party continue to want to filibuster substantive legislation as opposed to allowing things to pass?

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate Bill C-15, the budget implementation act. I am the member of Parliament for London—Fanshawe and part of the official opposition. The democratic process is to openly debate proposed legislation on behalf of all Canadians.

I am here to repeat what I hear from my constituents. They see a \$70-billion deficit, rising debt servicing costs and an industrial carbon tax that makes everything more expensive. They see neighbours being forced to go to food banks and young people giving up on home ownership. They do not feel the government's so-called historic investments; they feel higher bills, higher taxes and higher anxiety about the future. That is the reality I am bringing to the House.

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the Standing Committee on Finance, when the Parliamentary Budget Officer, an independent official appointed by consensus by Parliament, issued reservations about the budget, the response from the Minister of Finance, who was in front of me, was simply to undermine the credibility of the institution, to say that the Parliamentary Budget Officer was entitled to his opinion, that it was an opinion like any other, and that what he said ultimately had little value.

The same thing happened recently in a press release where the Minister of Finance continues to undermine the credibility of an institution that is essential to our parliamentary work.

I would like to know if my colleague agrees with the Prime Minister's approach, his lack of respect toward parliamentary institutions.

Does my colleague not find that, in a way, the minister is behaving a bit like some of the people we are seeing in the U.S. administration these days?

[*English*]

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Parliamentary Budget Officer and his response to the budget, I think it is actually quite concerning that there are some issues that he sees with the proposed budget, but I am here on behalf of the people of London—Fanshawe. It is my responsibility to the people who cannot afford another round of government experiments.

They are not asking for more bureaucracy or more glossy announcements. They are asking for a plan that makes life affordable again. The bottom line of this bill is higher debt, higher interest costs and higher prices.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, across Middlesex—London, I have heard from families that affordability is top of mind right now.

Government Orders

Parents are worried that their kids cannot afford to move out of their house. Even though they are well into their late twenties and have good educations and good-paying jobs, they just cannot afford to move out on their own because of the economy we are in right now. They cannot afford to pay for their groceries.

The parents are afraid of losing their jobs right now as we see pink slips going out across Ontario in our auto sector, so I am wondering if the member can comment on what he is hearing in London—Fanshawe from his constituents.

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, what I am hearing from the constituents in London—Fanshawe is that people are not asking for more Ottawa spin. They are asking why, after a decade of record spending, it is harder than ever to buy a home, pay the rent or afford groceries.

When I speak to the families, I hear exhaustion. I hear people telling me they have cut every corner they can and still cannot keep up. That is why I am focused on the cost of living and the impact of this budget implementation bill on real families, not on the polished narratives the Liberal government reads into the record.

Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just before we get going, I would like to put everybody in the festive spirit. This may be the last time we speak before we leave next week, and I want to say merry Christmas, happy holidays and the best of the new year.

I would like to remind people that there is a lot of great charity work going on in Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte. Some of the charities are doing great work to help out the needy, and I remind people to keep supporting them and the people who are volunteering to do that. I thank them for the hard work they do.

I will be working the kettle a few times over the holidays, and I look forward to it. It is always fun, but it is also rewarding because it is nice to say hello to people and to get those donations, which are much needed. The Salvation Army does fantastic work.

I would like to remind all my colleagues here, in case anybody is in the Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte area, as well as local residents, that we have some great parades coming up that I will be partaking in. We have one on Sunday, December 7, at Elmvale, which is always a great turnout. We have one on Saturday, December 13 in Warminster and on Sunday, December 14, in Anten Mills. I will be partaking in all those, and I am looking forward to that.

It is always nice to see people there and wish them a merry Christmas, so I encourage others to come out to enjoy the parade. I see my colleague down the row here smiling. He looks like he may be just driving over from the Goderich area to join us over there, so I look forward to that. That will be nice.

Let us get to business now. I am pleased to rise to speak today on behalf of the great people of Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte about the Liberal government's latest budget, a budget that would fail Canadians on every front from affordability to jobs, housing and immigration. I would like to focus on the unfortunate state of this country's finances after 10 years of deficit budgets and how the Liberal government's inflationary policies are affecting families in my community.

Let us start with some facts. Under the Prime Minister, the budget would add \$321.7 billion to the federal debt over the next five years. That is more than twice what Justin Trudeau would have added in the same period, and we all know that he was not afraid to spend. That eye-watering number equals roughly \$10 million every hour added to our national debt. Every single hour that passes, the Prime Minister is saddling residents in my community and across Canada with another \$10 million of debt.

Today, the national debt stands at \$1.3 trillion, and it will cost \$55.6 billion just to service this debt. That is more money than the government spends on Canada health transfer payments and more than the government collects in GST revenue. It works out to be more than \$3,000 per Canadian household just to pay the interest on that debt.

Meanwhile, Canada's GDP growth is stuck at 1.1%, the second-lowest in the G7, and the unemployment rates will average 6.4% over the next five years. It is not just Conservatives speaking out about this Liberal disastrous deficit spending. Fitch Ratings said that this budget's massive spending increase and debt burden weakens our credit profile and underscores the erosion of the federal government's finances. Dan Kelly, the president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, called the budget, "a missed opportunity to provide meaningful...relief to Canada's employers."

In the spirit of collaboration, the Conservatives tabled an amendment to the budget to boost take-home pay and deliver affordable homes and food. This would have been accomplished by scrapping hidden taxes on food; cutting taxes on work, homebuilding, investment and energy; and stopping the inflation tax by keeping the deficit under \$42 billion. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister and his finance minister ignored our pleas for a lower deficit and lower taxes and decided to add more than \$90 billion in new spending, which would keep inflation interest rates higher than Canadians can afford. That means higher taxes, higher inflation and higher food costs. The numbers do not lie. This is not fiscal responsibility. This is a budget of recklessness.

Government Orders

Now, I will turn to how residents in my community and Canadians from coast to coast are paying the price for the government's irresponsible deficit spending. Statistics Canada's latest data show that Canadians are paying more for food, gas and rent under the Liberal government as inflation, particularly on food, continues to outpace the government's targets. Food inflation in Canada is nearly double the Bank of Canada's target, and food prices have been rising 48% faster in Canada than they have in the United States. The cost of strawberries rose by 25%. Beef stewing cuts rose by 20%. Ground coffee rose by 20%, and chicken drumsticks rose by 17% between March and September.

• (1610)

Food Banks Canada gave the Liberal government an F on poverty and food insecurity after both rose nearly 40% in two years. A decade ago, individuals with full-time jobs were not relying on food banks to feed themselves and their families. Now, the high cost of groceries is exasperating food insecurity, and many Canadians are turning to food banks to make ends meet.

Just recently, Food Banks Canada released a report stating, "Employment is no longer a reliable buffer against poverty", and Canada is becoming "a country where hunger is normalized". In October, in my community, the Barrie Food Bank served 8,100 people, including a record number of children and seniors. That is a 16% increase from this time last year, and it is outpacing donations. Karen Shuh, the executive director of the Barrie Food Bank, stated:

We're sourcing as much food as possible at the lowest cost and recovering food that would otherwise go to waste just to keep pace, but the gap between what we can provide and what our community needs keeps widening. If someone gave \$1 last year, we now need \$1.16 just to keep food distribution at the same level.

Residents with full-time jobs, seniors and young people should not have to rely on food banks to make ends meet.

In response to these startling numbers, Conservatives put forward a motion calling on the Liberal government to stop taxing food by eliminating the industrial carbon tax on fertilizer and farm equipment, the inflation tax, the food packaging tax and the clean fuel standard, which adds 17¢ per litre of gas. Unfortunately, the Liberal government voted down this motion to remove grocery taxes, which continue to drive up the price at the till.

Housing is no better. The Prime Minister promised that the Liberal government would build 500,000 homes. However, a report from the housing industry indicated that the Liberal government's housing plan has gone from a promise of 500,000 to a plan that will cost 100,000 jobs. This report highlighted the latest preconstruction home sales data, which shows that, across Canada, sales have collapsed. In the greater Toronto area, sales of preconstruction single-family apartments have collapsed by 82%.

The Liberals also abandoned their promise to cut development charges, which can make up 25% of a home's cost. These fees have soared 700% in two decades, pricing countless Canadians out of the market. The Canadian Real Estate Association stated that this budget offers limited concrete measures to support Canadians aspiring to achieve affordable home ownership and risks slamming the door on home ownership for many.

Conservatives have a real plan to restore the promise of home ownership for a generation that has sacrificed enough. We want to

end the federal sales tax on new homes under \$1.3 million, tie federal infrastructure dollars to homebuilding, cut building taxes by half and axe the capital gains tax on reinvestment to get the housing we need built.

The Liberal government's budget also fails on the immigration file. Instead of fixing the housing crisis or controlling costs, the Liberals are making their immigration levels permanent, keeping over two million temporary residents in Canada by 2027, a 300% increase since 2015. The Liberals have no plan for the 500,000 undocumented persons or three million temporary workers whose visas are expiring. This failure erodes wages, increases unemployment and reduces access to housing, health care and child care for everyone. Canadians deserve an immigration system that is fair, just and sustainable, not one that hides costs and ignores security risks.

Our immigration system must put Canada first, which means inviting the right people in the right numbers, which we can absorb into housing, health care and jobs. It means having a system that allows newcomers to succeed as part of the Canadian family. It also means restoring the value of citizenship so that everyone who calls this country home, regardless of where they came from, is Canadian above all else. Conservatives will continue to fight to make Canada a place where anyone from anywhere can achieve anything by working hard, following the rules and contributing.

Finally, the cost of living crisis and the Liberal government's deficit spending is tragically affecting our young people. The most recent Statistics Canada's September labour force survey found that youth unemployment is increasing to 14.7%, which is the highest rate since September 2010. Students trying to balance school and work are in an even more desperate position, with 17.1% unable to find a job. This follows a brutal summer for our young people as the unemployment rate for returning full-time students averaged 17.9%, the highest rate since the great recession, excluding the first year of the pandemic.

I see that I am out of time. Perhaps during questions, I will be able to add the little I have left of my speech.

Government Orders

• (1615)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my last few questions, I have been trying to encourage the opposition to respond and explain to Canadians why they feel we should not be passing legislation in the House, even substantive legislation such as bail reform. The response has been that they want to be able to debate. It is a bit of a challenge.

I am not scared to work late. I am prepared to work late. A lot of Canadians from coast to coast work late. I would like the House to sit until midnight, not only tonight but for the rest of this week and next week, if necessary, so that we can allow those in the Conservative Party to debate the legislation, whether it is bail reform or budget reform. I am sure the member, if he truly wants members of the Conservative Party to debate, would agree with me and support a unanimous consent motion to that effect, which would enable us to have a good, healthy debate for the next couple of weeks. Surely to goodness, he would do that for Canadians so that we could have more debate in the House.

Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I am looking around the room right now and I see a lot of Conservatives on this side here and ready to work. The member opposite talks about work. We are here; we are ready, and we are working.

Our constituents put us here to discuss things, not just to pass bills blatantly. I keep hearing that the Conservatives are filibustering. I am not filibustering; I am here doing my job. We get paid good money. We get sent here to do a job. My constituents expect me and, I am sure, all my other colleagues to do the job, and that is what we are doing.

• (1620)

Terry Dowdall (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member represents my neighbour riding. I am sure he knows, since he comes from a municipal background, as I do, that in the last 10 years, many municipalities have had major concerns. There is increased food bank usage and a huge homelessness problem. It is something my riding is trying to address.

I know that a mayor in the member's riding declared a state of emergency to fix some of the problems that have been created by the Liberal government, which have put people in these situations. I am wondering if he could comment on the state of emergency that has been invoked in the City of Barrie.

Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I did not know the member was going to mention it, but it is great to hear. It is unfortunate what has happened in Barrie and many cities, most cities, all cities across Canada, quite frankly. I had this discussion recently with my two young sons, who are in their twenties. I told them that what they are seeing today is not the Canada I grew up in or the Canada I remember. They do not know what it was like then. They think seeing tents on the side of the road, tent encampments in every forest and every park is a normal thing. It is not normal. I took a tour across Canada, and it has infected many cities across our country.

The nice thing is that in Barrie, our strong-willed mayor, His Worship Alex Nuttall, did declare a state of emergency and is actually doing something. He is cleaning up the city. First, he is trying to get people the help they need. There is an addictions problem

and a homelessness problem, but there is also a lawlessness problem. A lot of people are afraid to mention that right now, but that is what is going on. He is trying to address that issue, and I know he is cleaning up Barrie right now.

From residents, I am hearing the exact opposite of what I was hearing a few months ago. They are pleased with the direction; they are pleased that he is taking the initiative, and they are pleased that he is trying to clean it up. I support him wholeheartedly. Barrie is starting to look better and get back to what it once was.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, roughly halfway through the nearly 650 pages that make up Bill C-15, there is a hidden amendment that gives any government minister the power to exempt any company from any federal law, other than the Criminal Code, for a period of three years. Bloc Québécois members find this very disturbing.

What does my hon. colleague think?

[*English*]

Doug Shipley: The short answer is that it does not sound like a good deal to me, Mr. Speaker.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to start with a happy bit. It was five years ago on Sunday that I stood in the House and announced to the whole nation that my daughter's water broke and I was going to be a grandfather for the first time. This past weekend, we celebrated my granddaughter Ren's fifth birthday. She is the light of my life, and I never knew that someone's heart could grow so big. She is incredible. I know she watches when I am up speaking, so I just want to say happy birthday to my granddaughter Ren and that Papa loves her.

I have an incredible team, and they prepared these speaking notes for me, but I am going to go off-script, as I often do, and I am just going to talk about home. The last couple of weeks have been absolutely devastating for my riding of Cariboo—Prince George, with the loss of West Fraser in 100 Mile and the loss of the Drax pellet plant in Williams Lake. Not only that, but I know there are more closures yet to come in our province of British Columbia. I know that a significant closure will be announced later today. I have been on the phone non-stop with mayors and councillors. I have been on the phone non-stop with British Columbians who have lost their jobs, and they are facing uncertain times.

Government Orders

It is really frustrating for me. For 10 years, I have been in this House and worked collaboratively across party lines. For 10 years, we have been hearing that forestry matters from members on the other side and that they would get a softwood lumber agreement in place, yet they have not. In the last three weeks, I have raised the issue again. For the first time since I have been a member of Parliament, and perhaps ever, we had an emergency take-note debate on forestry. It was the first time ever. While I applaud the Speaker for allowing us to do that, it is shameful, because these are real jobs. This impacts Canadians from across our country at a time when we cannot afford to lose more jobs.

We can never afford to lose more jobs, but the Prime Minister campaigned on being the man with the plan who could get a job done, which is what Trudeau did in 2015. He then told us all, Canadians and the families and communities that depend on forestry, that he could get a job done within 100 days of the new U.S. administration, and here we sit 10 years later.

It is hard for me, because I want to think that everybody has the best interests. I want to see the good in people. It is really hard when I stand up and raise the issue, and we have colleagues across the way who heckle us and tell us that we are making it up, or who laugh and say that it is feigned anger or feigned outrage. It is real.

It is real disappointment, because Canadians put their trust in these guys across the way. The calls I have taken have been absolutely heartbreaking. There are communities such as 100 Mile, where the loss of West Fraser is \$1 million out of its tax base. Its budget is \$3 million, so 30% of its municipal tax base is gone. What happens when those families leave? They do not come back, so we have communities all across our province that are drying up. That is no BS; it is the truth. The budget does nothing for that.

• (1625)

We have a Prime Minister who shrugged his shoulders two weeks ago and said, “Who cares?” when asked when he last spoke with Trump. He said, “Who cares?” To him, it is not a “burning issue”, and it really does not matter.

That was a flippant, arrogant answer, but it should not surprise any of us. We see that every day when he is here. It so frustrating, to hear families on the other end who are crying and emotional, with mayors and councils who are wondering what is going to happen when the other shoe drops. Members should believe me; that is going to happen.

Today, Algoma Steel announced 1,000 job layoffs. We have more to come in the forestry industry. At this time of year, it is hard to hear. It is hard to sit here and listen to the garbage being spewed from across the way at us.

Members know the budget was 500 pages long, yet mental health was mentioned once. We have an opioid crisis; over 50,000 Canadians have died since 2016, which is more than in World War II, yet there was not one mention of that in the budget.

The Liberals have spent \$1 billion in the last 10 years on their safe supply, perpetuating addiction, killing people and killing Canadians. Can members imagine how many beds that \$1 billion could have created? How many recovery centres could it have funded?

I know the one guy they allow to stand up, out of the 171 members they have on that side, is going to talk about this being a generational budget and talk about bail reform. We can look at the violence against nurses, health care workers and first responders that is being perpetuated every day. We had a bill that passed in the last Parliament; it should have been law by now. It would have given protection to those who protect us, yet at the dissolution of the past Parliament, it fell off the Order Paper because of these guys' playing silly buggers, because of the games that they are playing.

The Senate unanimously passed Bill S-233. We brought it back here three weeks ago to try to do the same, to give assurances to those who stand for us, our silent sentinels, those who run into burning buildings, those who hold our hand as we take our last breath. We tried to tell them that we are fighting for them just as they fight for us, that violence is unacceptable and it is not part of their job description. However, the other side is playing political hot potato with them as well. I cannot imagine anyone who would want to be part of that team. I cannot imagine being on the doorsteps in their ridings, trying to defend their record. For 10 years, we have listened to the promises and listened to the garbage being spewed from the other side. They have failed every step of the way. That is being witnessed and experienced in our ridings today.

Last week, it was 300 jobs in my riding. That brought the total to over 3,000 jobs lost. Today, there were 1,000 layoffs at Algoma Steel. I am sure that, by the end of the day, we are going to see more jobs lost. That blame falls squarely at the foot of this front bench and the Prime Minister. The Liberals campaigned by saying they had a plan. They sold a bill of goods to Canadians once again. Today is not a day for celebration at all. I know they are going to stand up and say Canadians have never had it so good. We now spend more servicing our debt than we do in health care transfers. It is shameful how far we have fallen.

I wish I had 20 minutes because I could go on and on about the failures of the government. It is absolutely shameful. I will cede the floor for questions.

• (1630)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about first responders. I too have great respect for first responders in many different ways, as I believe all members of the House do, including the Prime Minister. Having said that, it is also in Bill C-14.

It is interesting. I have raised this issue before. We talk about important legislation that the Conservatives try to prevent from passing through procrastinating or filibustering. In particular, the one that upsets me is the bail reform legislation. I believe it should be passed. There is no reason it could not pass before Christmas. The only thing preventing that, and that includes the first responders aspect, is the Conservative Party of Canada.

I wonder if the member would agree with me. If it is all about the Conservatives wanting to debate, why would he not agree to sit until midnight for the next two weeks?

Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the member has been spewing the same talking points from the government side. For nine years, he defended their track record in terms of bail and not jail. Ten years, and now all of a sudden it is a priority for him.

We will take no lessons from that colleague. There are 170 other members of Parliament on the other side. I dare any one of them to stand up.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that this budget was put together in a hurry and that the Minister of Finance was not ready.

The deficit will reach almost \$80 billion this year alone. Now, to meet their deficit targets, the Liberals must find \$50 billion in budget cuts over five years.

Of the \$50 billion in budget cuts, they have identified only \$10 billion, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer and other observers believe they will have difficulty implementing even half of that \$10 billion.

I would like to know if my colleague thinks the government will be able to meet its spending reduction targets. If he does not think the government will be able to do that, is he concerned that the deficits will be significantly higher than the \$78.5 billion already announced?

• (1635)

[*English*]

Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, the simple answer is yes. It is going to be higher because the Prime Minister does not answer to Canadians; he answers to the shareholders of Brookfield. For sure that spending is going to go higher. He has to answer to the shareholders of Brookfield.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Prince George. We share the city of Prince George and also many of those hits that have been given to our local mills and forestry workers. We have heard that 10,000 direct jobs and three to five times that in indirect jobs have been affected by the fact that the Liberals cannot get a softwood lumber deal done.

We have heard that the government has given extra EI to forestry workers and the like. Is that what our friends in Prince George are looking for, extra EI, or are they looking to get their good jobs back?

Government Orders

Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, that is probably one of the most frustrating things that we see and hear. In our regions, our forestry workers are proud by nature. Canadians are proud by nature. They do not want handouts, EI or welfare; they want a job. It is really frustrating.

Imagine being 55 or 56 years of age and having worked a lifetime in an industry only to wake up one day and be told that job is no longer there. In many cases in my riding, a lot of these people started right out of high school. It is the only job they know, so they may or may not be retrainable. What are they going to do? There is not another job coming behind to backfill that or a well-paying job available for them. While the handouts are appreciated, especially at this time, what they really want to see is jobs.

I truly believe that if an agreement had been in place long ago, we would not be where we are right now, seeing the incredible numbers in job losses. That is a failure that falls squarely at the feet of the Liberals.

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-15 is more than a budget bill. It is the government's attempt to convince Canadians it has a road map for the future. However, when we study what is inside this legislation, we see the same pattern that has been holding Canada back for years now: big promises, vague plans, new bureaucracies and no real path to get anything built or to keep our country secure.

That is why the issues I am about to raise are not side notes; they are symptoms. What we see in this bill mirrors what we are seeing in our major projects, our national defence and our relationship with the United States. There is confusion where we need clarity, more bureaucracy where we need action and politics where we need common sense.

If Canadians want to understand the gap between the government's promises and its performance, they do not have to look far. Take, for example, the much-celebrated pipeline deal between Alberta and Ottawa. It is clear that this deal is going to be handcuffed by the new bureaucracy created in Bill C-15. If Canadians only read the headlines, they would think Canada was already breaking ground, that the steel was ordered, workers were hired and the future was finally on its way.

Government Orders

However, hope is not a plan. When we actually sit down and read the six-page memorandum of understanding, we do not come away feeling inspired. We come away wondering how something this confusing could ever lead to a single inch of pipe in the ground. The memorandum says that approving and starting construction on the pipeline is a prerequisite for moving ahead with the Pathways carbon capture project. Then, on the very next line, it says the Pathways project is a prerequisite for approving and building the pipeline. Two things cannot be prerequisites for each other. It is like trying to tell Canadians they cannot start the car until the engine is running, and the engine will not run until the car starts.

Then there is the timeline. Under this agreement, Alberta and Ottawa, believe it or not, will create something called an implementation committee. The job of that committee is not to start construction, streamline approvals or get shovels moving. Its job is to determine the means by which Alberta can submit a pipeline application to the new Major Projects Office.

Let us think about that. We created the Major Projects Office to approve major projects. Now we are creating a committee to figure out how to send an application to that office. Only this government could design a process that complicated just to figure out where to drop off the paperwork. Under the memorandum, that application is supposed to be ready to submit by July 1, 2026. That is just the start. It could take another couple of years before the federal government decides whether to approve the pipeline.

However, the Pathways project is supposed to start construction in 2027. We are right back where we started. The pipeline depends on Pathways; Pathways depends on the pipeline. Canadians are left with a promise trapped in a hall of mirrors. If an investor is looking at this, what would they hear? Would they hear certainty? Would they hear clarity? Would they hear a country ready to build, or would they hear layers of process, more committees, more offices and no clear sign of when anything would actually move?

Then there is the broader question, the one Canadians are beginning to ask. Why are we the only major oil-producing nation on earth tying new pipeline capacity to massively expensive and uncompetitive carbon capture megaprojects? When we line up the top five producers in the world, the U.S., Saudi Arabia, Russia, China and Canada, four of them are not doing this. Only Canada is. When Canada is the only producer tying itself in knots while its competitors move freely, maybe it is time to pause and ask why.

Why are we building the most complex, costly, unpredictable pathway to development in the world? Why are we creating more steps when we need clearer rules? Why are we making it harder for Canadians to succeed while other nations are making it easier for themselves? Canadians deserve a country where the rules are clear, timelines are real and if we do the work, consult communities, invest capital and meet the standards, we could actually build something.

Right now, this so-called pipeline deal does not give Canadians that confidence. It gives them an MOU that reads like a logic puzzle and a process that seems determined to bury ambition under paperwork. Canadians are not asking for miracles. They are asking for a chance to build, create, grow and contribute to a strong and secure

future. They deserve a government that makes that possible, not one that ties every major project in a knot before it even begins.

If the government can tie itself in knots over a pipeline, it should be no surprise that the same drift and confusion found in Bill C-15 has now reached our national defence. That brings me to the next issue, our military readiness and the way the government is handling our most important defence partnership, the one with the U.S.

• (1640)

Let me begin by saying we cannot keep a country safe if we spend more time picking political fights than picking the right equipment for our forces. Our relationship with the U.S. is unlike anything else we have. It is not just a handshake across a border; it is a shared defence of a continent. It is NORAD. It is the Arctic. It is generations of Canadians and Americans serving side by side. It is 45% of our entire economy. Therefore, when the government shrugs at that relationship, when the Prime Minister tosses up his hands and says “Who cares?” about a sitting president, it travels further than he thinks. It echoes in Washington, raises eyebrows in NATO and feeds a dangerous idea that Canada is willing to play politics with its own security.

Nothing illustrates that better than the government's sudden wobbling on our fighter jet replacement. Canadians are not interested in the technical jargon; they want to know one thing. Will we give the men and women who defend this country the tools they need? Will we stand with our closest ally? Will we make decisions based on security, not political mood swings?

For years, our pilots have been flying aircraft older than many of the people serving in them. Replacing those jets is not a luxury but a necessity. After much study, Canada finally selected a modern aircraft that meets our operational needs and aligns us with our closest partners. Now, instead of finishing the job, the government is flirting with a detour, an attempt to look less American by cozying up to Europe, even if that means buying aircraft that do not meet all our requirements or splitting the fleet in a way that makes training harder, maintenance more expensive and readiness slower.

Government Orders

We do not strengthen sovereignty by weakening our air force, and we do not negotiate effectively with the U.S. while poking it in the eye over the very things it has been urging us to fix for decades. Our allies notice these mixed signals, the Americans especially, because for them this is not about emotion. It is about whether Canada is serious about defending the continent we share. Right now, they see a government trying to send symbolic messages to Europe at the expense of practical co-operation with a partner who actually protects our skies every single day.

With that said, it is important that we touch on the fact that our current Minister of Industry, the one who is now out shopping for jets in Sweden, does not even read the contracts she signs. Now she is floating the idea of abandoning or splitting our fighter fleet, not because it makes Canadians safer, not because it strengthens NORAD and not because our pilots are asking for it, but because it might create jobs, perhaps, if everything works out exactly right. Now that might get her a performance bonus, but it will put our fighter pilots and the safety of our citizens on the back burner.

Canadians want maturity in foreign policy. They want steadiness. They want a government that understands that we cannot insult our neighbour and neglect our obligations, and then expect a warm welcome when we show up asking for trade concessions or continental defence guarantees. Canadians are watching closely because these choices have real consequences. When a government buries projects under red tape, nothing gets built. When it sends mixed signals to our allies, our security weakens. When it makes decisions based on politics instead of clear thinking, Canadians pay the price in higher costs, lower growth and a country that feels like it is slipping out of their control.

Bill C-15 asks Canadians to accept more bureaucracy, more uncertainty and more risk. It asks them to trust a process that has not delivered in over 10 years. Canadians have every right to expect better. They want a country that can build a pipeline without tying itself in knots. They want a military equipped to defend our Arctic and honour our commitments. They want a government that is steady, serious and focused on results, not theatrics.

Leadership means putting the country first, not political ideology. It means choosing certainty for businesses, safety for citizens and fidelity for our partners. Bill C-15 does not reflect those needs. Canada works best when we allow our citizens freedom, protect what matters and build strong partnerships with our neighbours. That is how we work toward a better future for Canada, and that is the direction we as Conservatives will always choose.

● (1645)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the member used the military as an example. Her leader, when he sat in the Conservative caucus, was the lapdog to Stephen Harper, and at the end of the day, they had under 1% of Canada's GDP in terms of military spending. With this Prime Minister, elected just eight months ago, we are at 2% of the GDP and growing.

However, my question is more in regard to the destructive force that the Conservatives play, day in and day out, inside the House of Commons today. I have picked up on this, not only on this particu-

lar bill but on an important piece of legislation that Canadians, provinces and stakeholders like law enforcement want passed, and that is the bail reform legislation. The only thing that is preventing it is the Conservative Party of Canada. I have even made the suggestion, because they say they want to have more debate: Would the member not agree that if that is the only excuse the Conservatives can come up with, it is about time we started sitting until midnight so we can accommodate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order.

I have to give some time to the member to respond.

The hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City.

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, this bill, Bill C-15, chooses political theatrics over performance, and it buries major structural changes in hundreds of pages, creates new powers with no guardrails and pushes Canada further away from the partners and systems that keep us strong. That is why this debate matters. Canadians cannot afford another bill that puts politics first and leaves results for another day.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government is talking about its new program, or the new entity, Build Canada Homes. This morning, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported that this program will add only 26,000 units over five years, barely 2% more than expected supply growth, but that federal spending on housing will decline 56% in the next three years.

How can the government claim that it wants to double the pace of construction when there is no concrete plan on the table and the announced investments will not even offset the programs that are set to expire?

● (1650)

[*English*]

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-15 is filled with long-term commitments and big promises, just as we see in building homes bigger or better, yet it delivers no credible path for readiness, whether economic or military. The way this government handles pipelines and procurement shows exactly why Canadians should be wary of a bill that adds more bureaucracy while cutting services. This is all part of the same problem.

Government Orders

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have been here for most of the day, and I find the line of questioning coming from the government member for Winnipeg North very interesting. He stopped talking about Bill C-15, because he does not have any more questions to ask and we put forward the argument that it really would not help everyday Canadians. Now I think he is worried about an upcoming cabinet shuffle and that he may lose his job, because the government is not getting the job done. The government is not getting its legislation passed.

I was in government in Saskatchewan, and I always thought it was incumbent on the government to get its own legislation passed and get the stuff implemented that it wanted to. It was not the opposition's job to get bills passed in the legislature in Saskatchewan, so the member is really in trouble for not fulfilling any of his duties and may therefore lose his job. The louder he gets, we know the more trouble he is going to be in, because he is a complete failure at being a House leader.

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, the core of the matter is that this same old Liberal government that buries pipelines under more bureaucracy is now sending our military into the future with uncertainty, drift and political posturing. Whether it is major projects or major defence decisions, Canadians are getting the same result: confusion at the top, bureaucracy in the middle, and weaker outcomes for the people who rely on this system every day. That is why I am raising these concerns; it is because the stakes are simply too high to accept muddled leadership.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise this afternoon on behalf of my wonderful neighbours in Oshawa and speak to the recent Liberal budget and Bill C-15, the budget implementation bill.

As a mother of two, a 21-year-old and a 15-year-old, I cannot help but look at the direction of our beloved country with some deep concern. In fact, it is why I decided to run and why I stand here today; it is because I am concerned so much for my children's future and for the next generation.

I hear these same worries from parents in my community every single day. They are raising their children in a Canada that feels less secure, less affordable and less hopeful than the one they grew up in. That truth weighs heavily on families across the country.

Canadians are tired of working harder while falling further behind. They are tired of hearing promises that never turn into results, and they are tired of being told that everything is fine when they are the ones standing at the checkout counter, wondering what they can no longer afford. They are tired of being told to wait, to be patient, to trust a government that has repeatedly shown that it cannot deliver what Canadians need most.

Every week, my neighbours in Oshawa reach out to me and tell me the same thing. They are doing everything right. They budget carefully, shop around, choose generic brands perhaps, and stretch every dollar as far as it will go, but the price of everything continues to rise faster than their paycheques.

Instead of offering relief, the Liberal budget has asked them to keep paying more. Year over year, food costs have increased 3.4% under the Liberals. They had a chance to lower food costs for Cana-

dians by scrapping the industrial carbon tax, a policy that increases the cost of fertilizer, fuel and farm equipment. Instead, of course, they chose to increase it, making food even more expensive and pushing families into hardship. The numbers speak for themselves. Beef is up 16.8%, fresh or frozen chicken up 6%, seafood up 8%, apples up 4%, oranges up 7%, fruit juice up 7%, carrots up 11%, and the list goes on. Even infant formula, something no parent can go without or goes without, is up nearly 6%.

These are not just statistics. They are the quiet sacrifices of families who put back fruit because it no longer fits the weekly budget. These are parents splitting chicken breasts to stretch them across multiple meals. These are seniors choosing between nutritious food and essential medication. These numbers represent real people with real stories, real anxiety and real hardships.

When I speak with young families, they tell me they buy less fruit, less meat and fewer healthy options because they simply cannot afford them anymore. Seniors are telling me that they are skipping meals to stretch their pensions. Parents tell me they go without so their children do not have to. This is not the Canada they grew up in, and it is not the Canada they want to leave to their children and their grandchildren.

Instead of acknowledging these struggles and presenting a real plan to fix them, the government has gone forward with another costly budget that makes life even more expensive. It spends more and delivers less. It ignores the daily reality of Canadians who are already making impossible daily choices.

Affordability is not an abstract policy challenge. It is a crisis in real time. It is a mother standing in the grocery store, putting items back because the total is already too high. It is a senior, sitting in the cold because they are afraid of what their heating bill will look like. It is a young person working two or three jobs, not to get ahead but simply to avoid falling behind.

Despite what I have heard from some older Canadians, I believe that our young people, specifically gen Z, are possibly among the hardest-working of all generations. They simply want good jobs and an affordable life, and they are ready to work hard to do it, but they need the jobs and the job security.

Government Orders

In Oshawa, Simcoe Hall Settlement House recently shared heart-breaking news with me. Families who have never needed help before are now walking into the food bank. Even long-time donors cannot give anymore because they themselves are struggling to get by. One mother said her kids sometimes miss school because she cannot afford to pack a lunch. Imagine a parent having to make that choice in a country as blessed as ours.

• (1655)

These are people this budget was supposed to help, but once again, they have been left behind. After a decade in power, the Liberal government has perfected the art of announcements, yet it has completely abandoned the art of delivering outcomes. The Liberals talk about priorities, but their priorities are not the priorities of Canadians.

Canadians want lower food prices, they want lower taxes and they want stability and certainty. They want a government that understands the basics and focuses on the essentials. This budget does none of that. Instead of giving parents real relief so they can afford to feed their own families, the Liberals point to a national food program, which may sound helpful on paper but does nothing to fix the affordability crisis. Moms and dads want jobs, and they want the ability to feed their own children. They do not want to have to rely on a national food program.

It does not get better than this: Of all the taxes the government could have reduced or eliminated in this budget, it chose to eliminate the luxury tax on yachts and private jets. I guess this is for the Liberals' elitist friends. Instead, the luxury tax remains only on vehicles. It might as well be a car tax or a vehicle tax. Some of these vehicles are needed by our farms and our workers. They need their trucks, and these trucks are now in the category of luxury, but they left the tax on that.

The cost of living crisis is not an accident. It is the predictable result of policies that have made everything more expensive. The industrial carbon tax increases the cost—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, I see that I am getting some heckles, and that means that I am touching on some points that they do not like too much.

The industrial carbon tax increases the cost of transporting food, growing food and processing food. It increases the cost of heating barns, operating tractors and running food production facilities. Farmers feel it, truckers feel it, food processors feel it and families feel it every single time they shop for groceries. When we raise taxes on the people who produce food, the cost of food goes up, period. It is that simple, but this government still refuses to accept it and continues to try to gaslight Canadians into thinking that somehow our food prices going up has nothing to do with the industrial carbon tax and food packaging tax, which clearly are driving up the cost of food.

Canadians expect their government to make responsible choices. They expect spending to be targeted, not wasteful. They expect tax dollars to be respected, not taken for granted. They expect leadership, not excuses. Nothing in this budget reflects those expecta-

tions. Instead of offering relief, the government continues down a path that has weakened the economy and punished the very people it claims to help.

The more the government spends, the more inflation rises; the more it taxes, the more families struggle; and the more it intervenes, the worse the outcomes become. Canadians are simply asking for a government that understands their reality, a government that knows the difference between a press release and a plan, and a government that measures success not by how much it can spend but by how much better life becomes for the people that it serves.

Canadians deserve better. They deserve a government focused on lowering costs, not raising them. They deserve a government that respects taxpayers, not one that treats them like an endless source of revenue. They deserve a government that listens, understands and acts.

Budgets are more than financial documents; they are moral documents. They reveal what a government values and whom it chooses to prioritize. Families want affordability, stability and opportunity, but instead they get higher prices, higher taxes and fewer chances to get ahead.

Canadians are tired of struggling. They are tired of being ignored. They are tired of broken promises and failed policies. They want a path forward, and this budget does not provide one. Canadians deserve a plan that brings down costs, supports workers, strengthens communities and restores hope. They deserve a government that respects their struggles and delivers real solutions. They are not getting that from this Liberal government or from its budget.

Canadians deserve better. It is time for a government that values the people who built this country, feed this country and keep this country going. It is time for a government that focuses on results and not rhetoric. It is time for a government that puts Canadians first.

• (1700)

Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just in reference to the member's commentary in her speech about the luxury tax, my understanding is that it was costing more to actually collect the tax within the department than to levy the tax. This would be a cost-saving measure within cutting red tape in government.

Surely, she is supportive of that. Would she not be?

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure if that is true. I ask that the member provide me, maybe at a later date, some proof of this. I would love to see it.

Government Orders

However, that still misses the point. Canadians are tired of being placated with words. They need action that will actually make a difference for them. My last name is Kirkland, which means it is deeds, not words: *facta, non verba*. I sure would love to see the government provide a scenario where we are taking care of deeds and not words. Announcements mean nothing.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Finance heard from the governor of the central bank, Mr. Macklem. The Conservatives asked him whether he thought that the industrial carbon tax was contributing to inflation. The Governor of the Bank of Canada confirmed that, unlike the consumer carbon tax, the carbon tax for large emitters did not generate any form of inflation, as this involves commodities that are often exported.

When the Conservatives kept hammering away and tried again to get the governor of the central bank to say that it was contributing to inflation, he replied in English that if they were looking for inflation, they should look elsewhere. There are plenty of reasons to oppose this budget, but at a certain point, when they start contradicting the governor of the central bank in a debate, is that not an example of the Conservatives indulging in a bit of disinformation from time to time?

• (1705)

[*English*]

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, well, I am happy to contradict the governor of the central bank sometimes, especially when eventually he might become our Prime Minister, like the one we have right now. Canadians are not stupid, and they are getting tired of being treated like they are. Listen, the truth is this: We know that with a carbon tax on the big emitters, that cost will be passed down to the consumer. It was a simple bait and switch. Canadians will not be gaslighted any longer. We now have just simply made the consumer carbon tax a hidden tax, which we are paying for anyway. It is just being passed down to the consumer, and Canadians are tired of it. I hear it every day.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague is from Oshawa, and I am hearing from my constituents that they are afraid of losing their jobs. We just heard this week that CAMI is laying off workers, and it is right before Christmas. I know she represents a community that also has a lot of auto workers, so I am just wondering if she would like to comment on what she is hearing from her constituents back home in terms of job losses and what they are fearful of.

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful that my colleague brought this up, because that is something that is near and dear to my heart. I believe Oshawa is the centre of the heart of auto in the country. I believe our folks in Oshawa are very concerned about their jobs. We are looking at 1,000, possibly 2,000 more on the supply chain, auto jobs that are being lost next month at Christmastime. Everyone is worried. Everyone is scared. They do not know if the government really cares, and it does not help that we have a Prime Minister who says things like, “Who cares?” and that he will go talk to the President about trade “when it matters.” Someone today said, “Don’t you know? There is a trade war.” I said, well, we would not know it listening to the Prime Minister,

who says, “Who cares?” and that he will talk to him “when it matters”. It matters now. Auto jobs matter. Jobs in my hometown matter.

Ben Carr: Mr. Speaker, the member referenced an increase to the industrial carbon price. The Premier of Alberta agrees.

Does she believe the Premier of Alberta is wrong?

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, it is not my job to stand here and decide whether or not a premier of a province is right or wrong, unless it is my own province. It is my job to stand here and tell the government what we think about its budget implementation act. This is what we are discussing here today.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we are analyzing the 10th Liberal budget, the most expensive budget in Canadian history, costing \$16 billion more than the Prime Minister promised on the campaign trail.

I will begin by saying that there is nothing in this budget to address the problems facing families who are already struggling to make ends meet, nothing for young people who are contemplating their future with utter despair, convinced that they will never be able to afford a home. In fact, the Parliamentary Budget Officer said today that the Liberals will not be able to fulfill their promise of building 250,000 homes in five years. In reality, it will be 26,000 homes, or 10 times less.

There is nothing for small and medium-sized businesses. I would like to remind members that 99% of businesses in Canada are small and medium-sized businesses. There is nothing in there for them. It has been 10 years of broken promises. During my election campaign, I said that history gets written just once. Well, I want us all to take a look at the current situation after 10 years of Liberal governance, because that will give us some idea of what the future holds. When we look at what has happened, when we look at our history, we can predict where we are headed. Year after year, the Liberals have run deficits. They prioritize ideology over facts, and there is a very worrying tendency to always try to please everyone, as though the bank account is bottomless. The sole aim is to make people happy today in order to get their vote in the future. I believe this seriously undermines Canada's economy and our future.

Government Orders

In fact, recently, in the context of the budget, the Liberals did not negotiate with us. They did not sit down with us, even though they are a minority government. They completely ignored the requests and proposals of the opposition parties. They were willing to spend over \$600 million to trigger an election to win a few seats and get a majority. That is the Liberal way: spending money to promote their ideas and points of view and disregarding the public. Of course, they would have blamed the Conservatives. They would have said that it was the Conservatives who wanted to trigger an election before Christmas. All we were asking for was an affordable budget so that Canadians could have access to a promising future, not a future with debt for generations to come. The answer we got was that the situation we were in was the fault of the United States and Donald Trump.

When a government is not properly prepared, when it runs up debt year after year, when it spends recklessly and ends up in a bad situation and a bad position, can it really blame that on someone else? Should the government not look in the mirror and admit that it should have done more to prevent this situation? The reality is that there is no world where there will never be tough times. However, the Liberals do not seem to see that. They want to live in a fantasyland. Would a smoker really be surprised to learn they have lung cancer? I doubt it. Would someone who gets no physical activity and overeats regularly say that there was no way to see it coming when they have a heart attack? I think we all know the answer, and that answer is no. When a government relies on an ideology that assumes that it can spend endlessly and live in a world that is out of touch with the reality of taxpayers, it puts itself in a position where, when times are tough, it has no financial cushion and the situation is precarious.

As I said earlier, history gets written just once. I would like us to look at our Prime Minister's past. Before he became Prime Minister, he was the head of Brookfield, a Canadian company. When things started getting tense with the United States, he moved the company's head office to New York for his own benefit. During the election campaign, the prospective prime minister was asked a question. He was told that Brookfield was Canada's biggest corporate tax evader, owing \$6.5 billion in unpaid taxes in Canada. He was asked whether he would fix this problem if he became prime minister. He replied that he would ensure that businesses pay their taxes in Canada. So far, he has done nothing.

When he became Prime Minister, he was asked to cut ties with Brookfield. Well, last week, Brookfield's chief operating officer came and told us that he had no problem coming to Canada for coffee with the Prime Minister and spending half a day in his office. When he announces Canadian investments abroad, Brookfield is always there a day early or a day later in the same sectors.

• (1710)

Last week, our Prime Minister was in Alberta where he announced plans for pipelines, carbon capture, nuclear energy, data centres and power lines. Just a little bit of research shows that Brookfield is heavily involved in all these sectors. That is the reality now. Canadians are starting to question this much-talked-about budget that spends their money in sectors that seem to greatly benefit our Prime Minister. When we cry scandal here, we are told that we are conspiracy theorists, so I will look at other facts.

The Liberals promised to keep the deficit at \$62 billion, which is already far too high, but now the budget is projecting a deficit of \$78 billion. They said that they would reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio, but that ratio has increased. They promised to lower inflation, but it has gone up. They promised to reduce spending, but it has increased by \$90 billion. They promised to help municipalities by cutting their taxes on new housing construction in half, but that is another broken promise.

The budget asks Canadians to spend more on interest on the debt than on health transfers to the provinces. That is huge. We are getting so deep into debt that we are paying more in interest than we are investing in something as crucial as health care. The Liberals are patting themselves on the back for creating more social programs and telling themselves that they are responding to demand and that Canadians need those programs. The problem is precisely that: Demand is growing, and the Liberals are congratulating themselves because it is growing.

There are needs in our communities, and there are children who are going hungry. Everyone would agree that children should be able to eat their fill. No one is against that. However, there is nothing to be proud of when this trend is on the rise, there are more and more children going to food banks, and more and more families struggling to make ends meet. I have been speaking with food bank representatives, and they told me recently that the face of poverty is changing. In the past, it was people who were unemployed, perhaps even newly arrived immigrants. Today, it is Canadian and Quebec families. Parents who are both employed have to choose between eating, having a roof over their heads, and having a car to get to work. That is the reality, but the government pats itself on the back for doing a good job and creating more and more programs year after year. That is the problem.

Einstein said that doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is the definition of insanity. I will leave it to my colleagues to decide for themselves whether that accurately describes the situation.

I mentioned health transfers earlier. Something in the budget that really stood out to me is the total lack of investment in prevention, and the total lack of investment in sports and physical activity.

Let us take a look at the leading causes of mortality in Canada, and hear what the associations dealing with these conditions have to say. The cancer association says that the cornerstone of cancer prevention is to promote physical activity, reduce the amount of time spent sitting, and educate people about the benefits of physical activity. Heart disease is the second-leading cause of death in Canada. Regular physical activity significantly reduces the risk of stroke. In addition, 90% of cases of type 2 diabetes can be eliminated with physical activity. Physical activity also reduces degeneration and lowers the risk of Alzheimer's disease.

Government Orders

The prevention of illness should be a major focus for governments at the municipal, provincial and federal level. To improve health, we have to acknowledge that the solution is not to wait until illness strikes before we take action. Reactionary budgets are always deficit budgets.

My colleague asked a question last week about the government's \$500-million investment in the European Space Agency site. The answer really caught my attention. We were told that every dollar invested generates \$3 in Canada. I like that kind of answer, because when you invest in physical activity, every dollar invested generates a return of somewhere between \$3 and \$20, with a recognized average of \$13. It is the best return on investment when it comes to physical health, mental health and community health. That would be a generational investment, but there is nothing about that in the budget. As a result, our population is becoming poorer in terms of health, and we will all be forced to pay the price.

The Liberal government has divided its budget into two categories: investments and spending. I wish it would do the same for the health of Canadians by investing in prevention and focusing on healing, because it needs to invest more money in that area.

• (1715)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have made a decision, and that decision is to filibuster whenever they can, in order to not allow legislation to proceed, whether it is the budget implementation bill or the bail reform legislation. I find it unfortunate.

If the issue for the Conservatives is nothing but being able to have more debate time, then let me make a suggestion. I have no problem whatsoever working until midnight for the constituents of Winnipeg North. Liberal members of Parliament are prepared to work. This budget is a reflection of the interests of Canadians. It is part of building Canada strong and making Canada the strongest nation in the G7. We are prepared to work.

Would the member not agree with me and say that the Conservatives are prepared to work until midnight so we can facilitate more debate, whether it is on Bill C-15 or on bail reform legislation? Will he take me up on that?

[Translation]

Gabriel Hardy: Mr. Speaker, it is quite funny to hear my colleague say that he wants to spend more time here. I think he has spent more time here than anyone else in the history of humanity.

This budget is unacceptable. I was emphasizing that we need to invest more in Canadians' health, invest more in prevention. I am not using the term "invest" in the sense of spending. I am saying that we need to invest more attention in these areas.

When I look at the expenditures made by my colleague and his government, I see \$19.2 million for inclusive agri-food systems in Nigeria, \$29 million invested in South Korea, \$123 million invested in China, \$10 million invested in inclusive and sensitive climate change adaptation in Ghana.

Is that their idea of investing properly in Canadians? To me, that is nothing but throwing money out the window. It should go somewhere else.

• (1720)

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very informative speech. What he forgot to mention is that, when it came time to vote on the budget, the Conservatives wanted to avoid an election so badly that they hid some members, including their House leader, behind the curtains.

On voting day, they were hiding behind the curtains and in the washrooms to abstain from voting and ensure that the budget passed. It was when they realized that the NDP and the Green Party had caved that they came out to vote. All 22 of the Bloc Québécois members voted against it.

I want my colleague to answer the following question. If the budget is so horrible, what was his House leader doing hiding in the washrooms on voting day?

Gabriel Hardy: Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to see my Bloc friends say such things. In fact, they voted against the budget, saying it was a spendthrift budget, and the next day in the House, they asked the government to invest money in a private company in Quebec.

One day, they say that it is terrible to spend so much. The next day, they say that the government is not spending enough on their colleagues at TVA, whom they love so much, and that the government should give them money. That is exactly the problem with the Bloc Québécois. There is always a double standard, and that is what we keep seeing time and time again.

[English]

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend's speech was great. I know he is a great representative for his constituents and his riding. I also know he was a business owner involved in the health industry, and I know he knows that in a business, one cannot spend more than one makes. We all know what the long-term results of that are.

Can the member expand on what it means to his constituents when the government spends more than it has?

[Translation]

Gabriel Hardy: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question, and I like comparisons. In the private sector, companies may sometimes run deficits because they are investing in the future and engaging in development activities. However, nobody in the private sector loses money every year for 10, 11, 12 or 15 years and pats themselves on the back for it.

Never getting back to balance and accountability is a major mistake. This is people's money the government is spending. That money belongs to hard-working people.

As I mentioned earlier, 98% of Canadian businesses are SMEs. In Quebec, it is 99%. These people work hard every day, pay their taxes and struggle to make ends meet while the Liberals spend their money recklessly. It is disrespectful, and it is certainly not the way the public expects the government to manage things.

[English]

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House and speak on behalf of the citizens of Saskatoon West, the greatest riding in all of Canada, I have to say. I know there are other members who may not quite agree with me, especially the one sitting beside me, but I am very proud to represent Saskatoon as a whole and Saskatoon West specifically.

We are talking about the budget today, and I have to say that the budget implementation act is a very large document. It is an omnibus bill of 600-plus pages, with all kinds of things in it. I can say right off the start that I will not be supporting the budget.

It is not that there are not a few good things in the budget. There is a small tax cut, and that is always good, but as the Parliamentary Budget Officer said, it will amount to about \$280 a year for the average family in Canada. That is great, and I would never deny that to somebody in Canada, but honestly it is not a generational, massive, amazing, incredible thing. It is just a very small amount, but every little bit helps. The budget also has the largest deficit we have had outside COVID, \$78 billion, while there is a cost of living crisis in Saskatoon and right across this country that is very real.

First I want to talk about debt. This is a very serious problem in our country. The amount of debt being racked up is really unconscionable. I think some Canadians, in the last election, thought they were getting a good money manager, a banker, somebody who really knew how to handle money. Remember that a banker's main job is to make money, and by that I mean physically print money. They actually make money. They want money to be loaned and flowing, and I think that is exactly what we are getting from the Prime Minister right now.

Let us look at the numbers. The deficit from the previous prime minister, Trudeau, which we all thought was crazy big, was \$36 billion. That was a huge number, especially compared to previous deficits, at least in normal times. Of course during COVID it was a bit different. Everybody talks about Stephen Harper's having to run some small deficits. He got panned for a \$10-billion deficit. We are talking \$36 billion. The new Prime Minister has no problem doubling that to \$78 billion.

The deficit is massive. Yes, it is going to come down a bit over the five-year period that is in the budget that was presented, but it will come down to \$57 billion, which is still significantly higher than the \$36 billion, which in turn is significantly higher than any numbers we have ever had before.

If we add all that up over the six-year time horizon that is in the budget document, it is \$360 billion of deficits over just six years. If we look at the interest payments on that, we see that right now they are at about \$53 billion a year. It climbs up to \$76 billion five years from now. If we add that up, it is \$382 billion in six years, just in interest. That is money thrown away, given to bankers. It is the same amount of money that we spend on health care and the same

Government Orders

amount of money that all of us pay in GST. Whenever we buy something, we can think of the 5% GST that we pay going specifically to pay the interest on our debt. It is terrible.

Speaking of the debt, in 2015, the total debt of the country was \$600 billion, and by that I mean it took literally 150 years, the entire length of our confederation, to grow that debt to \$600 billion. By the end of the time horizon five years from now, it will be at \$1.6 trillion; it will have gone from \$0.6 trillion to \$1.6 trillion. That will be \$1 trillion of debt added by the government if it continues for the five-year period. That is totally unbelievable and unconscionable.

I want to talk a little about housing prices, because they have gone way up. They have climbed and are very expensive. Even in Saskatoon, where housing is not as expensive as in Toronto or Vancouver, rent has gone up about 25% over the last five years. Instead of paying \$1,000, people are paying \$1,200 or \$1,300. It is really crazy. At the same time, over the same period in the last three years, median incomes in Saskatoon have dropped, actually gone down, so while rent is going up, incomes are dropping, making it very difficult for people to make ends meet. With a 25% rent increase versus a 9% wage increase over a five-year period, it is very difficult. No one can buy clothes or groceries.

Speaking of groceries, food inflation is running extremely high right now: 34% over five years. Food banks in Saskatchewan are now serving 55,000 people per month. In Saskatoon, 23,000 people use the food bank every month, which is up from roughly 17,000 per month in 2019. That is an increase of about 35% in five years.

● (1725)

Christmas dinner is going to be more expensive for everyone right now. If we think about what makes a great time at Christmas, it is getting together with family and friends and eating turkey, stuffing, potatoes, carrots, ham, Brussels sprouts, pumpkin pie, perogies, sausages and all the wonderful things that really make that time a lot of fun. Brussels sprouts can't be right; scratch that.

I will quickly go through a list of increases we see right now. Beef ribs are up 114%; beef strip loin is up 74%; beef top sirloin is up 62%; chicken breast is up 52%; a dozen eggs is up 54%; my wife's favourite, coffee, is up 76%; olive oil is up 120%; margarine is up 67%; cheddar cheese is up 59%; butter is up 57%; pasta is up 50%; and baby formula is up 71%. Baby formula is now almost always the most-stolen item in stores, because young moms and dads cannot afford to buy it. This is causing hardship for everyone. Parents should not be stressed about buying food for their kids.

Private Members' Business

I cannot support the budget. Canadians need real solutions to handle the cost of living crisis they are seeing right now. They cannot afford the government and the moves it is making. We need to actually do things to increase the wages of our people. We need to have meaningful projects that actually create jobs and increase the wages and earnings of our people so Canadians can afford to feed themselves, clothe themselves, buy housing and live the way they are intended to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

NATIONAL STRATEGY ON FLOOD AND DROUGHT FORECASTING ACT

The House resumed from October 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-241, An Act to establish a national strategy respecting flood and drought forecasting, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my honour today to speak to the private member's bill, Bill C-241, an act to establish a national strategy respecting flood and drought forecasting, put forward by the MP for Terrebonne.

[Translation]

As always, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the people of La Prairie—Atateken.

[English]

Bill C-241 proposes the development of a national strategy to ensure that partners and stakeholders have access to the information they need to forecast floods and droughts.

Canadians are on the front lines of climate change. They are increasingly experiencing its devastating impacts in the form of extreme weather events such as heat waves, drought, wildfires, heavy rainfall, floods and powerful storms from coast to coast to coast. Flooding is the most common and costly disaster in Canada. In the past decade, floods cost nearly \$800 million per year on average in insured losses. Similarly, droughts affect the economic viability of water-dependent sectors such as agriculture and lead to increased risk of destructive, costly wildfires.

Across Canada, 2025 was a significant drought year, with dry conditions deepening and spreading across much of the country. The lack of rainfall and the intense heat helped drive one of Canada's worst wildfire seasons on record, especially in the Prairies and British Columbia. In Manitoba and other provinces, farmers faced parched fields and stressed crops, as prolonged dryness threatened yields and strained water supplies. As the bill states, damages caused by flood and drought have risen in Canada and are expected to rise further due to extreme weather and water events related to climate change.

Access to comprehensive, high-quality data and information is essential to support water quantity forecasting, particularly as more and more Canadians are exposed to extreme weather and water

events. A national strategy on drought and flood forecasting would ensure that Canadians can better respond to severe weather events and reduce the impact of climate change by accessing information required to make, in some cases, life-saving decisions.

The Government of Canada is already carrying out key activities in relation to flood and drought forecasting. For example, National Hydrological Services, under Environment and Climate Change's Meteorological Service of Canada, is the federal authority responsible for the collection, interpretation and dissemination of standardized water quantity data and information in Canada. The service administers a national hydrometric program by way of a collaborative cost-sharing partnership with provinces and territories.

Through this partnership, National Hydrological Services operates 2,300 water quantity monitoring stations on lakes and rivers across Canada. This represents 77% of the national program, with the remainder being operated by provincial and territorial partners. The data provided by this network of monitoring stations is made publicly available on the web in near real time. This provides an integrated view of surface water in Canada to all governments, as well as the academic and scientific communities, industry and the Canadian public, to support flood and drought forecasting, water management and emergency response across the country.

These hydrometric data, along with weather and other environmental data and analysis products generated using Environment and Climate Change weather and environmental modelling and high-performance computing systems, are essential to provincial and territorial forecasting programs. The data are also used to feed hydrologic prediction models that generate water quantity information and flow predictions products. These are shared with provincial and territorial governments to support them in their responsibilities related to hydrologic forecasting, transboundary water-sharing agreements and water regulation planning.

In budget 2025, the government proposes to invest \$2.7 billion over nine years to modernize the Meteorological Service of Canada's high-performance computing capacity. This system runs the model required to produce accurate weather forecasts, alerts, warnings and climate projections, as well as the Meteorological Service's environmental data reanalyses and hydrologic prediction models.

Private Members' Business

Timely and accurate weather prediction is essential to key sectors of the economy, such as agriculture, transport and marine shipping, and helps Canadians make decisions to protect against adverse impacts of extreme weather, such as flooding. While flood forecasting and warnings are the responsibility of provinces and territories, Environment and Climate Change Canada works daily with provinces and territories to provide integrated briefings on weather-related conditions that may cause a threat to Canadians. Moreover, federal government departments and agencies work together in delivering critical services to Canadians in relation to flood and drought forecasting.

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

For example, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the department responsible for drought monitoring, uses Environment and Climate Change Canada's weather forecasts to issue drought forecasts. Natural Resources Canada leads flood mapping efforts to provide Canadians with critical information about their flood risks. The department also produces critical geospatial data used to urgently create maps and other near real-time data that are shared with Public Safety Canada and responders during ice jams or floods. Public Safety Canada plays a central role in coordinating the flood management efforts of federal departments and agencies during emergencies.

Despite all of the federal programs and initiatives, we know that flood and drought forecasting could be better coordinated across the country. An effective national strategy would build on programs that work well, such as those at Environment and Climate Change Canada. It would also identify ways to address existing gaps. We are already aware of some of them. These gaps include the lack of public awareness of flood risk data, the lack of information to identify and mitigate flood risks, and the potential lack of intergovernmental coordination on flood and drought forecasting.

Within five years of the strategy being tabled, the minister responsible must table a report on the strategy's effectiveness. This work will be done in collaboration with other relevant departments and in consultation with the provinces, municipalities, indigenous governing bodies, experts and stakeholders.

The global climate is changing and will continue to change, and Canada will be no exception. Extreme weather events will continue to occur, resulting in growing costs for our society. The need for a national strategy for flood and drought forecasting has never been greater.

That is why I am proud to say that the government supports Bill C-241. Although we support the bill, some provisions will need to be amended. We will encourage the committee to carefully review the provisions of the bill to ensure that the strategy does not duplicate measures that are already in place and to make the bill more effective in achieving its objectives. Nevertheless, I am very pleased to announce that the government will support Bill C-241.

• (1740)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to Bill C-241 today.

It is important for us all to recognize, at the end of the day, that having a national strategy respecting drought and flooding and our ability to forecast is critically important. When I say that, I would obviously recognize the lead roles that provinces and municipalities play in dealing with local flooding and so forth.

I am going to highlight that in the province of Manitoba, just to give a better sense of why it is so important that we have a strategy, we have had occasion to experience all forms of disasters. Flooding is probably the biggest one. In fact, we have a premier who is still referenced today because of flooding. That was Premier Duff, because he constructed what we call Duff's Ditch. It was that premier's vision to try to avoid the types of floods that were devastating, in particular, for the city of Winnipeg, so the government back then decided what it wanted to do was to take the water coming into Manitoba and have it go around the city of Winnipeg. Before we had Duff's Ditch, Winnipeg was constantly being flooded.

Every time there is a flood in the province of Manitoba or any sort of a climate issue in Manitoba, it is the province that often plays the lead. Municipalities will also get deeply engaged because those are the communities that are more directly affected and they look to the province for guidance, and indigenous communities also. Floods have a very significant impact in those areas.

When we talk about the strategy being proposed through the legislation, we recognize that it is not something that Ottawa does alone. We have to be able to work with the different stakeholders, in particular those different levels of government. It is absolutely critically important. However, in developing that strategy, it is also important for us to recognize that the federal government already does play a role, directly and indirectly.

My colleague made reference to things such as Environment Canada, which, generally speaking, does an outstanding job at being able to forecast and predict both short-term and long-term weather conditions. Environment Canada works with the different jurisdictions when issues of drought or flooding come up. We have other departments as well. When a flood takes place, we have the department dealing with emergency services, whether it is disaster relief or public safety.

Ottawa does play a role in regard to the impacts of flooding and droughts. To that extent, I would argue that we need to see national coordination take place. Ultimately, by working with the different levels of government, we could come up with a strategy that could help in the long run. That is what we should be hoping to achieve.

Private Members' Business

● (1745)

Within the legislation, from what I understand, there is a tabling of a document. If the legislation were to pass, within two years we would see that tabling of a document. That document, I think, could help set a framework based on co-operation. That is what I believe would actually take place. Canadians as a whole, as has been demonstrated by the Prime Minister and the discussions we have had with regard to things such as the one Canadian economy, respond very positively when they see the different levels of government working together.

The issue is serious. I have had first-hand experience. A couple of years ago, I was north of the beautiful community of Gimli, taking a tour of a cattle farm. The farmer was telling me about the drought conditions and how they needed to see more water on the ground. In other areas of the province, we had more of a flooding condition that was taking place: too much water.

I honestly believe that there is more we can do as a society to better manage the water that comes through snow and rain and so forth. The management is so important. That is why I was so pleased when the government of the day made the decision to have the Water Agency located in the province of Manitoba, in Winnipeg, for all of Canada, to look at ways in which we can improve not only the quality of water but, I would ultimately argue, the management of water.

If members think of the prairie provinces, I can tell them that it is a very serious issue. I hear about it in Saskatchewan. I know the concerns that Alberta has in regard to wanting to be able to retain water and use it for irrigation and other issues.

At the end of the day, in the province of Manitoba, we are very much concerned about the quality and the quantity of water that is coming into our province. It is not just an issue for Manitoba alone. We need to have something that goes broader, outside of the province. When I look at the legislation, I commend my friend and colleague for bringing it in, because we have recognized the importance of how the federal government can and should play a stronger role.

When we think of climate change today, we see that it is more extreme. More and more, we are seeing flooding. We are seeing disasters, whether they are fires, droughts or other disasters. I think it begs the question of what we are doing as a House of Commons, as parliamentarians, to address this growing issue into the future. That is why I look at the legislation as a visionary idea to bring forward.

I make reference to the two years. Not only does it have a mandate for two years; I believe that it also has an assessment that takes place five years later. We are not just saying that we want to have a committee and that the committee comes in and provides a report after doing a considerable amount of consultation and working together and coming up with that strategy. We also want to take a look at it a number of years later, formally, the first one tabled here in the House and the second one an assessment in terms of how it is processed or what has actually taken place over the years. How effective has it been? Are there ways in which we can improve the situation? I think that is something that is a very positive aspect of the legislation.

One of the reasons I would like to think that the member vested a great deal of energy in presenting the bill that is before us today is that, because it is a private member's bill, we have programming. We know that after two hours of debate, it is going to go into committee. That is the nice thing about private members' bills. I think we need to have more programming for government bills, but that is another debate for another day.

The point is that this is substantial legislation. It is sensitive to our environment. It helps all concerned, the many different stakeholders. It is legislation that we should all get behind and support, and I applaud the member for bringing it in.

● (1750)

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C-241, which proposes the creation of a national strategy for flood and drought forecasting.

While the intent to improve coordination and data sharing is commendable, the bill risks becoming yet another Ottawa-driven exercise in paperwork rather than delivering real solutions. Canadians have seen first-hand the devastation of floods and droughts, from Abbotsford's submerged farmlands to Lytton's compounded disasters of fires, landslides and so on. They know that forecasting alone does not save lives or homes.

Our communities need timely funding, streamlined approvals and regional collaboration to turn warnings into action. Bill C-241 offers promises on paper while families in my community, and in my former riding, remain vulnerable on the ground.

In November 2021, British Columbia endured an atmospheric river that devastated communities across the Fraser Valley and interior. Abbotsford's Sumas Prairie was submerged, highways and rail lines were washed out, and the village of Lytton, already scarred by wildfire, faced impossible recovery hurdles. These events were not isolated. They disrupted national supply chains and cost billions of dollars in lost trade and other related damages.

The failures we witnessed were not due to a lack of forecasting models. Environment Canada and the provincial agency had already issued flood warnings. We knew we were at risk of another flood. The real breakdown was in preparedness, funding and execution. Communities had data but lacked the resources and authority to act accordingly.

The irony is stark. While Ottawa drafts strategies to predict disasters, British Columbia lived through one, armed with forecasts but abandoned when it came to action and funding. Today, we still have not received infrastructure dollars to improve regions where we know other disasters are predictable and foreseeable.

While I acknowledge the positive intention of the bill and the previous one that was in the last Parliament, I continue to worry about why the federal government is ignoring the critical infrastructure needs of British Columbia. In Lytton, after the wildfire, and subsequent landslides and flooding, the village could not access federal mitigation programs like DMAF, because applications demanded extensive engineering analysis, something a town with one public works employee simply could not provide. Bill C-241 does nothing to address these capacity gaps or the reality of remote and indigenous communities.

In Abbotsford, when Sumas Prairie was inundated in November 2021, the devastation was unprecedented. Thousands were evacuated; tens of thousands of livestock were lost, and Highway 1, the backbone of Canada's supply chain, was closed for nine days. The city responded quickly, developing a \$2-billion flood-mitigation plan within six months, including new dykes, pump station upgrades and designated floodways.

However, despite the urgency, federal funding calls under the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund were closed. By the time applications reopened, critical months had passed, leaving Abbotsford vulnerable and forcing the city to shoulder many interim costs alone.

Mayor Ross Siemens expressed his frustration bluntly:

To find that our application was denied, that the City of Abbotsford won't be receiving the funding support that we need to protect our community from a future flood disaster, that is brutally devastating news.... We feel completely abandoned by our federal government.

According to an article, he added that "they were told that if the province was on board, they would likely get the DMAF money." He said:

That is brutally devastating news and shows a blatant disregard for our city, our region, our economy and, quite frankly, a disrespect for the fairness of due process.

I asked federal officials, after that devastating news happened in my community, whether they had even engaged with the city of Abbotsford, after the photo ops and people had left. The answer was no.

Four years later, recovery work is nearing completion, but Abbotsford remains far from flood-proof. Merritt and Princeton remain far from flood-proof. Lytton is only building up now.

• (1755)

This experience illustrates a core flaw in Bill C-241 and the broader approach to major disasters in Canada. Forecasting alone does not protect communities. Abbotsford is a mid-sized city. It had data and plans but lacked timely funding and streamlined approvals. Without access to climate change mitigation dollars and a government model that empowers local action, families in flood plains will remain exposed not only in Abbotsford but in other parts of the country. This is not because we cannot predict the next flood, but because we have failed to act in respect of climate adaptation and infrastructure investments that account for increased population and other factors, such as the forestry sector and the impact it has on our waterways.

I have another quick example. After the floods, the District of Kent reinforced its dikes, but the flood risk shifted downstream to

Private Members' Business

Seabird Island first nation, which had little protection. Again, I raise that point in the context of remote and indigenous communities, which do not seem to be properly addressed in this legislation.

Bill C-241, to my point, ignores the need for regional coordination and infrastructure, not just data sharing with the federal government. In summary, we have to look at jurisdictional overreach. The bill centralizes forecasting under Ottawa, but provinces already manage the system. What communities need is funding for mitigation, not another federal report.

My second point is that there is no funding mechanism. I recognize that this is a private member's bill, but the call for flood infrastructure in B.C. has been loud and clear.

Third, there are delayed timelines. The bill outlines two years to table a strategy and five years for an effectiveness report. We have all seen these tabled in Parliament. Frankly, why can the public servants not do this already? Why can the deputy minister not report to Parliament? Why do we need legislation like this in the first place? It is more bureaucracy.

Fourth, I would have hoped a bill like this would address the insurance crisis. Flood insurance remains inaccessible for many homeowners. Without reforms to make coverage mandatory and to broaden our policies federally on insurance, we are still going to run into many of the issues we faced in British Columbia because of the need for change.

What did we learn in 2021? We learned that disasters demand speed, flexibility and local empowerment. Local governments need continuous access to mitigation funds. We need improved cost-sharing models for rural and indigenous communities that do not have the capacity of mid-sized or large cities. Funding for public infrastructure needs to be brought in with higher standards to account for floods as well.

Private Members' Business

We also need an integrated regional model. For example, we have mayors from metro Vancouver coming to Ottawa who are demanding one thing for infrastructure, yet the demands in the Fraser Valley just a few kilometres away are different. That has never been coordinated. This legislation would not address the elephant in the room around the things that we need fixed in British Columbia.

In closing, Canadians deserve more than forecasts. They deserve action. We need a plan that delivers real dollars for mitigation, regional coordination and insurance reform. We do not need another Ottawa-driven report tabled in Parliament. Let us learn from what happened in B.C. Forecasting alone will not save lives. We knew the flood was coming in 2021. Investment and execution do save lives.

I implore the Liberal members of cabinet who have ignored me, who have ignored my community, to listen. I plead with them to help us, help Abbotsford, help Lytton and help the Fraser Canyon. All of Canada's trade to the port of metro Vancouver goes through my riding. They have ignored us. If this were Montreal or Toronto, the money would have already been spent. The upgrades would have already been done. However, we are not treated the same way in British Columbia, and that is not right.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-241, which seeks to create a new federal structure to improve flood and drought forecasting.

We all share the same goal, namely, to better anticipate climate events that are becoming more frequent, more severe and more costly. However, the proposed solution is not the right one. A careful reading of this bill reveals one thing that really stands out. It does not grant any new powers, impose any obligations on the government or provide any real resources. Bill C-241 does not solve any concrete problems. Above all, it fails to address federal inaction.

The Meteorological Service of Canada already has the mandate needed to produce forecasts, warnings and hydrometeorological models. Environment and Climate Change Canada already has all the tools it needs within its own legislation to modernize its capabilities, collaborate with Quebec and the provinces and support existing systems. If these tools are insufficient, the government should have started by amending the law and strengthening what already exists. However, Bill C-241 does not change anything. A system cannot be improved by simply announcing a new structure on paper.

The bill talks about supercomputers, sophisticated models and a national co-operative service. However, the most basic questions remain unanswered. Who decides? Who runs things, and with what money? There are no specific directions, scientific responsibilities or clear mechanisms for coordination in the text. In an emergency, ambiguity is dangerous.

When a river overflows or the ocean breaks through dikes, the last thing our municipalities need is an additional and duplicate structure. Clarity saves lives. Duplication creates confusion. Creating a new federal structure means creating positions, offices and

procedures. Meanwhile, municipalities have been waiting a long time to receive the support that was announced. Back home in the Lower St. Lawrence, people know this. While the paperwork makes its way from one department to the next, the waves wait for no one.

In the meantime, Quebec has made progress. We have world-class scientific expertise tailored to our land and waterways. One example is CEQUEAU, a hydrologic model developed by the Institut national de recherche scientifique that simulates the flow of water in rivers and watersheds and is used to predict floods. There is also Ouranos, a Quebec consortium known for the accuracy of its regional climate models. Another example that I am very proud of is the Institut des sciences de la mer de Rimouski, in my riding, which models coastal storms, erosion, ice and the unique characteristics of the St. Lawrence River. These are not abstract concepts; they are tools that protect real communities.

People in my region, the Lower St. Lawrence, have not forgotten the high tides of December 2010. That evening, waves several metres high struck Sainte-Flavie and Sainte-Luce with tremendous force. Some homes were damaged, some shifted. The main road was swept away by the sea, and the coastline receded in a single night. It was not a trivial matter for us. It was a clear sign of what climate change would bring to our region.

Since then, experts have confirmed it. Rising sea levels, the disappearance of the ice that once protected our coasts and more intense storms are accelerating erosion in eastern Quebec. What used to happen once in a generation is now happening much more often. Our coastal municipalities have been fighting for too long, practically alone. They do not need a new office in Ottawa. They need a reliable, involved and consistent partner.

Quebec, for its part, has adopted a modern legal framework with its Act to affirm the collective nature of water resources and to promote better governance of water and associated environments, as well as its Act respecting the conservation of wetlands and bodies of water. Quebec plans its interventions at the watershed level, as recommended by international best practices, and it already shares its hydrological data with its partners, which would be a good thing at the federal level as well.

We must also remember a simple constitutional truth: Waterway management, land use planning and emergency preparedness fall under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces. Canada is made up of many nations. To suppose that a single centralized model can serve such disparate realities is to ignore the fact that the risks, territories and jurisdictions are diverse.

• (1800)

Let us not forget the St. Lawrence River, a living and complex river that calls for detailed, local, place-based expertise. The government is grappling with soaring climate costs, but it is doing nothing to curtail the causes of climate change. Over the past 10 years, natural disasters have cost the country more than \$2.5 billion a year. In Quebec, compensation increases year after year, and insurance premiums rise accordingly. In many cases, less fortunate households are located in the most vulnerable areas. Adaptation is not just an infrastructure issue; it is also a social justice issue. In my region, the Lower St. Lawrence, farmers' soils are drying out, their crops are less robust and their costs are going up. Hydrological forecasting is not a luxury; it is crucial to food security.

There is a fundamental disconnect here. The government is proposing a new structure for predicting climate disasters while it continues to support oil and gas projects that make climate change worse. Improving our ability to predict storms while funding what makes them more violent makes no sense.

That is why the Bloc Québécois is proposing concrete measures: enhance the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund, provide more support to fight shoreline erosion, and implement a co-insurance program to protect households located in the most at-risk areas. These are not mere suggestions. These are realistic, workable solutions that people want to see.

Bill C-241 does not build any real capacity. It does not address any weaknesses within the Meteorological Service of Canada. It does not respect the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces. It does not help municipalities, which are already dealing with the climate crisis every day.

The climate emergency requires political courage, not imaginary structures. It requires results, not intentions. Quebec does not need a new federal structure. It needs the federal government to finally do its part. What is missing today is not a national strategy. What is missing is the will to act.

• (1805)

[English]

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House to represent our beautiful riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, a part of our country that is shaped in every way by water. Our sea, our rivers, our swimming holes, our creeks and our wetlands are an intrinsic part of our identity. They are where we fish, farm and play; where our kids swim in the summer; and where many of us first fell in love with the great outdoors.

On Vancouver Island, our water is not only beautiful; it is vitally useful. Properly harnessed, it provides us with clean, renewal energy. It nourishes the crops that feed our families. It incubates our salmon and provides inspiration for our cultural traditions. On Vancouver Island, water is fundamental to our lives. Whether it is the Nanaimo River, Haslam Creek, Westwood Lake, or Colliery Dam, our community feels a deep, personal connection to these places. Like most powerful forces, water needs to be respected, revered and conserved. When it rains, it pours for days on Vancouver Is-

Private Members' Business

land, and when it does not rain, the grass turns brown, the earth cracks and the landscape becomes tinder just waiting for a match.

The chaos resulting from extreme weather in B.C. threatens not just our livelihoods, but our very lives. Floods, earthquakes, tsunami warnings, droughts and wildfires uproot our lives and threaten to scatter us to the wind. Local farmers tell us about drought and water insecurity, which threatens livestock, stresses irrigation systems and creates the conditions for deadly wildfires. On the other side of the ledger, flooding can contaminate soil, erode coastlines, knock out power and wash away roads. Water is at the centre of almost every risk calculation we make. Water is part of our identity, but water can be volatile: too much or too little can threaten our lives.

This brings me to Bill C-241, which we are discussing today. One thing that unites people everywhere is our desire to know the weather forecast, along with the knowledge of the reality that it is usually wrong. However, we keep trying to predict the weather, and in Canada, doing that, like with many other things, means navigating the complex web of federal and provincial powers laid out in our Constitution.

The federal government provides much of our weather forecasting through the Meteorological Service of Canada, but the provinces and territories are responsible for flood forecasting and issuing flood warnings. The provinces and territories also have jurisdiction over specific applications and emergency management activities within their boundaries. The federal government predicts the weather, while the provinces and the territories manage the response on the ground to the impacts of that weather. What could go wrong?

Bill C-241, in a way, takes a crack at making one flood and drought forecasting strategy out of 13. It would require three federal ministers to work together, along with the provinces and territories, to develop a national strategy around flood and drought forecasting in the hopes of generating the information we need to better plan for these events. This is a noble cause, and as a means to greater collaboration, I support sending the bill to committee. I applaud my colleague across the aisle for raising these issues and facilitating this important debate. However, hope, as we all know, is not a strategy, and as an end in itself, the bill before us falls woefully short.

Private Members' Business

The past few years have shown how vulnerable British Columbia is to extreme weather, yet the federal government has not provided the support that farmers, homeowners and small businesses need to prepare and recover. Floods in B.C. and beyond have destroyed farms and livestock and left families facing massive repair bills, but federal programs have been slow, confusing, inadequate and underfunded. Many communities, including those that my colleagues have spoken of today, are still waiting for the promised assistance or have been told they do not qualify because the programs were not designed for disasters of this kind, scale, scope or whatever.

• (1810)

Instead of working with the province to build a faster and more reliable response system, the government has left people to navigate red tape while they are already under enormous financial and emotional strain. Canada's current model of disaster compensation is one under which taxpayers cover much of the cost of major flood events, and it is increasingly unsustainable as more and more insurance companies include carve-outs in their contracts that specifically exclude compensation.

Better forecasting and mapping could make private insurance more valuable, reducing the burden on the public purse. This is a point worth studying further in committee. If improved modelling can reduce risk and improve predictability, families and small businesses may have more affordable insurance options while taxpayers may face lower costs after major storms, but it is all a question of implementation and execution.

Provincial jurisdiction also needs to be respected. Water management is primarily a provincial responsibility, and communities on Vancouver Island rightly expect collaboration, not intrusion, from Ottawa. It is incumbent upon the government to ensure that coordination does not turn into federal overreach, as it does in so many cases. It means making sure the provinces can access shared tools and shared data when they need them. It means ensuring that modelling developed with public funds is accessible, standardized and usable across the country.

That standardization is crucial. Right now, rainfall, soil, moisture, lake levels, snowpack and stream-flow data are collected differently across different regions. This makes forecasting harder and emergency response slower. Any national strategy must ensure that provinces, municipalities, indigenous governments and industry can all share and interpret data in ways that are consistent and reliable.

I want to remind the government about the need to invest in the aging infrastructure needed to support major weather events like floods. In my community, Nanaimo Regional General Hospital is the backbone of emergency care, not only for Nanaimo but for much of the island, including in the case of flooding and tsunamis that could come with an earthquake. When roads wash out and communities are cut off, it becomes the critical hub for treatment, evacuation and coordination. However, NRGH's patient tower was built in 1963, making it the oldest on the island and one of the oldest of its kind in use anywhere in the country. It is not earthquake-proof, and in a real disaster, whether it is a coastal surge, widespread flooding or a seismic event, we might just not have it to rely on.

Local advocates have done a fabulous job of sounding the alarm, but the Liberal government's latest budget sets aside only \$5 billion over three years for health care infrastructure, including medical schools, across the entire country. It is nowhere near enough to help the provinces rebuild aging hospitals, reduce wait times or ensure that every Canadian has access to a family doctor. The government cannot convince Canadians that \$5 billion is a big number while trying to convince us that \$78.3 billion, when it comes to a deficit, is a small one. All that tells us that the government is not focused on building the infrastructure we need to withstand floods, earthquakes and tsunamis.

If we expect NRGH to serve as a lifeline during the next major flood or emergency and to provide safe, modern care every other day of the year, we need the federal government to recognize that nation building includes building hospitals with Canadian lumber, Canadian steel and Canadian know-how.

When I meet with families who love their local swimming holes, farmers who depend on predictable water supply or volunteers restoring local creeks, the message is the same: Our water systems are changing, and we need the tools to understand those changes and better coordinate our response to them.

I will support Bill C-241 at second reading so that the committee can examine it carefully, strengthen it and ensure that it remains practical, efficient and respectful of jurisdiction.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-241 raises the major issue of flood and drought prevention. These phenomena are no longer isolated incidents. They have become recurring realities that disrupt our communities, weaken our infrastructure, and threaten our economy.

The numbers cannot be denied. Over the past 10 years, the average cost of insured disasters in Canada has been \$2.5 billion a year. Last year, we reached an all-time high of \$8.5 billion in insurable weather-related losses. That is the cost of climate change.

In Quebec, an average of \$428 million a year is spent on compensation for climate disasters. These amounts are not abstract. They are very real. They represent destroyed homes, closed businesses, displaced families. They represent lives turned upside down.

That is not all. Prolonged droughts are affecting our agricultural producers. According to the Association des producteurs maraîchers du Québec, half of all vegetable growers have no insurance against drought-related losses because they cannot afford it. Meanwhile, municipalities are imposing water restrictions, and some even have to import drinking water.

We have seen forest fires ravage our forests. We have seen catastrophic floods force 6,000 people to leave their homes; that is what happened with the Lac des Deux Montagnes in 2019. In the riding of La Pointe-de-l'Île, we are also feeling the effects. We have to spend millions of dollars to combat riverbank erosion, and power outages are becoming more and more frequent.

These phenomena are all amplified by climate change, which the Liberal government has decided to ignore, pretending that it does not exist or making it even worse by investing in oil.

The Bloc Québécois recognizes the importance of improving forecasting and coordination, but why create a new federal structure when the Meteorological Service of Canada already exists and Quebec's environment ministry has recognized expertise, with 230 hydrometric stations that collect, analyze and disseminate data on water levels, flows and flood zones?

Bill C-241 is a distraction. It does not amend any provisions of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. It does not explain at all why these services cannot be provided by the Department of Environment's current meteorological services. I am actually a little surprised that my Conservative colleagues seem to want to support this bill at second reading, because, more than anything, I see it as another layer of bureaucracy.

Why would it be useful or necessary to create a new government organization in parallel to the Meteorological Service of Canada? There is no new funding. There are no concrete measures to support the provinces and municipalities. All the bill does is announce a strategy and schedule a report in two years' time. Meanwhile, disasters continue and costs soar.

Is the bill a response to the crisis or is it a communications exercise? Is it a tool for action or a smokescreen to create the appearance of action? The answer is obvious. It is all smoke and mirrors.

The Bloc Québécois is clear: We want concrete action. We want immediate investments to strengthen infrastructure resilience, support farmers, protect citizens and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

What do we see? We see some concerning setbacks: the elimination of consumer carbon pricing proposed by the Conservatives and supported by the Liberals; the suspension of electric vehicle incentives; and the scrapping of the zero-emission vehicle strategy. The government talks about adaptation, but is turning its back on addressing the underlying causes of the problem. It makes no sense.

We are proposing clear, costed demands: increase the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund by \$875 million; create a co-insur-

Private Members' Business

ance program for flood-prone areas to protect vulnerable households; invest \$500 million to combat shoreline erosion; and transfer funds to municipalities, which are best positioned to manage the consequences of climate change.

● (1820)

These are tangible measures. They respond to the real needs of communities. They would have an immediate impact. If we want to improve flood and drought forecasting, we need to focus on smart co-ordination, not the bureaucratic centralization that the Liberals are once again trying to impose.

The Quebec government already provides the public with weather, hydrological and flood forecasts. For example, the Vigilance web application provides 48-hour flood forecasts for many rivers in southern Quebec. To prevent flooding, Quebec uses numerical environmental forecasting, which is based on the collection of recent meteorological and hydrological data, including temperature, precipitation and snow accumulation on the ground, as well as numerical models. These numerical models simulate environmental processes, meaning the interactions between different components of the environment, such as the atmosphere, water, soil, vegetation and ecosystems, in order to predict how they will change over time.

The federal government's role should be to facilitate the exchange of information, to fund advanced research and modelling and to support provinces and municipalities in their adaptation efforts.

Quebeckers do not want a federal website that tells them it is raining. They want roads that do not collapse, houses that do not flood and farms that survive droughts. They want a government that takes action, not piles of reports.

That is our position. I think it is shameful to see the Liberal government abandon climate action. Indeed, an environmentalist, the former head of Equiterre, resigned from his position as minister. That is very symbolic. We will see what happens next, but if we do not get our act together, we are heading in a direction where we will see more and more environmental disasters, and bureaucracy is not going to solve the problem.

● (1825)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I would like to recognize the hon. member for Terrebonne for her right of reply.

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional unceded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin nation.

Adjournment Proceedings

We have debated Bill C-241 on the national strategy for flood and drought prevention. I think it is essential to speak to the House about the fact that this bill deals with an issue that directly affects the safety, well-being and resilience of our communities. Extreme weather events are now part of everyday life in many regions. Every year, municipalities across the country see their infrastructure weakened, their roads submerged, their soil dried out and their homes flooded.

I am thinking of my own riding of Terrebonne, where I have seen first-hand the very real effects of heavy rains. Sudden rainfall events, unexpected flooding, and erosion risks are not simply meteorological phenomena. They are part of our daily lives. When the Mascouche River or the Mille Îles River threaten to overflow, it is about more than just hydrological data. These are families who fear losing their homes, business owners who risk losing everything, and infrastructure that is being put to the test. That is precisely why Bill C-241 is essential. It proposes establishing a national strategy for flood and drought forecasting based on coordination and transparency.

If this strategy is to be truly effective, we need high-quality, consistent data. Today, each province, territory and indigenous government collects its own hydrological information using different instruments, observation networks that vary from region to region, and analytical methods that are not always compatible. These differences create silos that limit our collective ability to effectively anticipate floods and droughts. To move forward together, we need to narrow these gaps and strengthen interoperability. Bill C-241 does not seek to centralize or remove these powers, but rather to bring together this knowledge and these tools around a shared objective, namely, to strengthen our capacity to anticipate and prevent hydrological disasters.

Experts from across Canada, including UQAM, the University of Saskatchewan and across Quebec, are telling us how important good data coordination is. In this context, data sovereignty is essential if we are to have full control over our forecasting capabilities. Today, our country still relies on data provided by foreign agencies, such as NASA in the United States. While useful, this data has sometimes proven to be inaccurate or ill-suited to Canada's unique realities. Bill C-241 aims precisely to correct that dependence by strengthening our autonomy and ensuring that our decisions are based on data produced here for our own needs.

It proposes a co-operative model where information collected by different jurisdictions can be interconnected and analyzed jointly. That will allow us to offer all municipalities, from coast to coast to coast, the means to respond faster, to plan smarter and to protect their residents. The costs of doing nothing are already immense. In 2024 alone, insured losses related to climate events in Canada reached \$8.5 billion. Tropical storm Debby caused \$2.7 billion in insured damages in Quebec, and thousands of residents had to be temporarily relocated.

Bill C-241 provides a national framework for planning infrastructure, improving access to data, coordinating responses and, ultimately, saving lives. We need to choose prevention over reaction, coordination over isolation and resilience over vulnerability because so much more than property damage is at stake. At stake are people with faces, names and addresses, members of our communi-

ties. I invite my colleagues to support this bill so that we can work together on building a Canada that is better prepared to meet climate challenges.

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

• (1830)

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

Tatiana Auguste: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, December 3, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

FINANCE

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, the budget included \$97 million to establish a foreign credential recognition action fund. According to the budget, this fund would help address doctor shortages by supporting credential recognition of foreign-trained doctors. Given that there are at least 13,000 internationally trained doctors currently in Canada but not working as doctors, can the government tell us exactly how many doctors this \$97-million fund would get licensed?

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the question that was submitted had to do with spending on the backs of future generations. There were concerns about whether the Prime Minister realizes that his spending is lining the pockets of his banker and bondholder friends, instead of funding our doctors and nurses.

Budget 2025 makes generational investments while maintaining Canada's strong fiscal advantage. This foundation allows us to make ambitious and responsible investments and build a Canadian economy that is the strongest in the G7.

Adjournment Proceedings

We are changing how government works, spending less on operations so we can invest more in Canada's future: creating high-paying careers, building our country and growing our economy.

Budget 2025 introduces a new approach to fiscal discipline and strategic investment. Our ambitious savings plan means Canadians can count on their government to be more efficient in delivering essential services while reducing operational costs. In fact, we are slowing growth in direct program spending from 8% to 1%. We are also introducing a capital budgeting framework that clearly distinguishes day-to-day operational spending from capital investments. That will strengthen our economy and make it grow for Canadians.

The result is that more public funds will go to the infrastructure needed to build the country, clean energy, innovation and productivity, and fewer public funds will go to day-to-day operating expenses. Sound fiscal management is a vital part of reallocating resources and enabling the intergenerational investments that will secure Canada's future.

At the same time, we were very clear in the Speech from the Throne. Even though the government will be spending less, transfers to provinces and territories will be maintained. This includes the Canada health transfer, which provides provinces and territories with predictable funding for health care.

As the hon. member may know, this transfer will increase by at least 5% per year until 2027-28. In addition, the 2025 budget announced the creation of a \$5-billion health infrastructure fund. This fund will complement the support already being provided to provinces and territories in the area of health care. It will help them ensure that their health care infrastructure, such as hospitals, emergency services, urgent care centres and medical schools, can meet the health care needs of Canadians.

We are taking a collaborative approach with all the provinces and territories. Canadians deserve timely access to health care services wherever and whenever they need them.

• (1835)

[English]

Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, the member clearly did not answer my question. I asked how many doctors this \$97-million foreign credential recognition fund would get licensed. Does the government have any idea how many doctors would get licensed for \$97 million?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Madam Speaker, budget 2025 is about fiscal responsibility. We are determined to make responsible choices to reduce government operating expenses and wasteful spending, so Canadians can invest more in the workers, businesses and infrastructure that will build Canada strong, and so we can strengthen our health care system in collaboration with the provinces and territories.

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, what is the consequence of a weak immigration system? It is extortion.

What is the consequence of a government that believes that the perpetrators of crime are in fact the victims? It is extortion.

What is the consequence of loosening bail conditions and reducing sentencing for violent crimes? It is extortion.

We have an extortion problem in Canada because we have a Liberal government that has weakened the Criminal Code. Families and businesses are all suffering the consequences because of the Liberals' decisions.

First, with regard to a weak immigration system, when immigration screening and enforcement are lax, transnational gangs exploit these gaps to recruit members, move individuals across borders and establish operations in Canada. This creates an environment where organized crime thrives, enabling intimidation and extortion schemes targeting vulnerable businesses, especially in sectors like transportation and retail. Strengthening immigration enforcement and closing loopholes are essential to prevent criminal infiltration and protect Canadians.

Second, the government treating perpetrators as victims is an erosion of deterrence. Policies that prioritize offenders over public safety weaken accountability. When violent criminals are portrayed as victims, sentencing becomes lenient and consequences diminish. This emboldens repeat offenders, undermines deterrence and signals to criminal networks that Canada is a low-risk environment for extortion-related crimes.

Third, loosening bail conditions and reducing sentences increases violent crimes. Bills like Bill C-5 and Bill C-75 in previous parliaments have allowed dangerous offenders to be released repeatedly, eroding public confidence and enabling crime to spread. The result is that extortion threats in British Columbia have surged 481% since 2015. Firearms-related offences are up 130%, and homicides have risen 29%. These trends show that soft-on-crime laws are directly correlated with escalating violence and intimidation.

Adjournment Proceedings

Canada's extortion crisis is not isolated. It is the product of systemic weaknesses in immigration enforcement, criminal justice philosophy and bail-sentencing laws. Businesses and families are paying the price for policies that have prioritized criminals over communities. A year ago, Conservatives put forward a plan to tackle this head-on. Indeed, I sponsored the bill to put in force mandatory jail time for extortion with a firearm and to remove house arrest as an option for these violent crimes. The Liberals did not vote for it. They voted against it. Since then, thousands of new extortion cases have expanded across Canada.

The government's refusal to act until recently has only emboldened criminals and left victims without justice. When will the government make the change, bring forward the legislation that is going to have a real impact and stop this crisis, which is ruining the reputation of Canada, ruining businesses and ruining families?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about extortion in Canada, particularly in British Columbia. I can assure the House that the Government of Canada is actively working on this file and that it is more committed than ever to protecting Canadians, regardless of where they come from or where they live. All Canadians and Canadian interests must be protected from all criminal threats, including extortion and related acts of violence. This is not a soft-on-crime policy at all. It is quite the opposite.

Serious organized crime is complex, so a multi-pronged response to these criminal networks is essential. Incidents of extortion are alarming, and support is in place for those affected. Anyone who feels threatened online or in person should report the situation to local police.

In the Government of Canada's budget 2025, we announced an investment to hire 1,000 new RCMP members to increase federal policing capacity across Canada and combat organized criminal networks that threaten Canada's economic and national security, as well as 1,000 new CBSA officers to help crack down on illegal arms trafficking.

The Government of Canada also introduced bills C-2, C-12 and C-14, which seek to strengthen immigration and border security, combat transnational organized crime, tighten bail laws, and increase penalties to protect Canadians and strengthen the security of our communities.

Bill C-2 proposes modernized tools to facilitate law enforcement's lawful access to basic information and data. These measures are crucial to disrupting sophisticated organized crime networks that use modern extortion schemes. However, the Conservatives oppose them. I hope they will change their vote when we discuss this further next week.

Bill C-12 seeks to secure our borders and strengthen our immigration system by giving new powers to the Canada Border Services Agency and Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. This will improve Canada's response to the rise in extortion by strengthening border enforcement and administration and improving information sharing.

Bill C-14 establishes stricter bail and sentencing requirements by making it harder to get bail for violent and repeat offences as well as for organized crime. It also proposes consecutive sentences for serious and violent crimes. These reforms prioritize the Government of Canada's response to deter serious organized criminal activity, including extortion, and protect the public safety of Canadians. These commitments build on the Government of Canada's ongoing efforts to protect Canadians from extortion and other violent crimes.

In 2023, Public Safety Canada renewed the initiative to take action against gun and gang violence, which provides \$400 million over five years to provinces and territories. Our government also launched the building safer communities fund in 2022, which provides \$250 million directly to municipalities and indigenous communities to strengthen gang prevention programs and address the social conditions that give rise to crime.

In conclusion, we know that there is more work to do. We are taking the necessary steps to make our communities even safer. If the Conservatives are serious about addressing extortion, they should support Bill C-2, Bill C-12 and Bill C-14.

• (1840)

[English]

Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, Conservatives have been very clear in the House that we are generally in support of many of the measures in Bill C-12 and Bill C-14.

In respect of Bill C-2 and the Liberal government now tying it to extortion, the reality is that we are in a minority Parliament and the Liberals never work with us. They never addressed some of the charter challenges that will inevitably come from that legislation. If the Liberals would have acted in good faith, they would have seen more co-operation from the Conservatives, as we have done on many major policy initiatives that we initiated in the first place and that have been passed by this Parliament.

The reality is that extortion can be correlated directly to the changes to the Criminal Code that the Liberals brought forward. Once we removed any form of deterrence in our society, crime went rampant. It is what happened. I just implore the member opposite and I implore the government—

• (1845)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Adjournment Proceedings

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Madam Speaker, our government is proud of the work it has undertaken to protect Canadians from extortion and other violent crimes. We are proud of the work we have accomplished on the ground. Since February 2024, for example, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has established a national coordination and support team, forming a national alliance to coordinate and advance extortion investigations across Canada. Through this national team, the RCMP works with police services across Canada and internationally to address extortion crimes and violent incidents.

In addition, a B.C. extortion expert group was created last September and so far has already identified 96 individuals—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Langley Township—Fraser Heights.

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Madam Speaker, a little while ago I asked a question in question period on the topic of the ever-increasing price of groceries. Food inflation is running at about twice the rate of the average rate of inflation in this country, so many people are hurting in a real, tangible and, I might say, painful way.

I made the point, in my 30-second question spot, that food inflation is hitting seniors particularly hard. Many seniors are on a fixed income. I would point out that for the people who are fortunate enough to have an indexed pension, the indexing is to the average rate of inflation, not food inflation, so even those people are hurting in very real and tangible ways.

In my question, I quoted Myrna, and it bears repeating what she had to say to me in an email. She said, “I worked and planned for my retirement my entire life and now it's taking everything I have to live.” That is the painful part of inflation. It erodes people's purchasing power. Myrna did nothing wrong; she did everything right. She saved up for her retirement. It was going to be enough, but then she was facing inflation, and that is a reality for many people.

I could have quoted others, but I had only so much time in my 30-second time spot, so I am going to take the opportunity now to read into the record a comment from Darcy, also from my riding: “I know that you are aware [of] the cost of living and your party knows this; unfortunately [the Liberal Prime Minister] does not.... There are thousands of seniors lining up at food banks and looking for affordable housing.... There are way too many seniors who have to make a choice about whether to buy food or [pay for] rent”.

Laine had this to say: “[Seniors] are also caught up in all the price increases, cost of living and taxes but nobody is being our voice and fighting for our secure and dignified retirement.... When was our last cost of living [increase]?” I am trying to be the voice for Laine and other people like her.

These are just a few examples. I know many seniors are wealthy and have nice pensions and comfortable homes with no mortgages, or maybe they have sold a business and are living comfortably, but I am speaking for those who are struggling, and there are many of them.

That is why I was so disappointed with the answer I got from the Secretary of State for Seniors. This is what she said: “I speak to seniors in my home riding...all the time, and they are proud of what this government is doing, that we have taken action that actually helps seniors in this country to age with dignity.” I do not know whom she has been speaking to; it is probably the wealthy pensioners but certainly not the people who are struggling.

She went on to highlight some of the handouts the government has given. I am sure that people are always happy to get some of their tax dollars back, but it misses a point. She said:

We are cutting red tape. We are building homes faster. We are providing dental care....

On this side of the House, we have a great record.

That is her perspective. It is not the perspective of many seniors who are struggling.

The problem with the Liberals, in my opinion, is that they think they have all the answers. They think they are the solution to the problems, whereas the reality is that they are the cause of many of the problems Canadians are suffering from. This is particularly true for seniors, who are at the wrong end of inflation and are seeing their savings being eaten away by inflation that is caused by the government through overspending and deficit budgets. After 10 years of mismanagement by the federal government, inflation is deeply seated.

My question is this: Will the Liberals acknowledge that their never-ending deficit spending and money printing is causing inflation that continues to hurt Canadians?

● (1850)

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Langley Township—Fraser Heights argues that our government is responsible for a never-ending cycle of inflationary spending and deficits. I would argue exactly the opposite. I believe we are taking action specifically to prevent this inflationary cycle. We live in an uncertain and rapidly changing world. Around the world, the trade relationships that help ensure good jobs and affordable products are being disrupted. Here at home, rising tariffs are posing significant challenges for Canadians, as we know, particularly those who work in trade-exposed sectors such as manufacturing.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Government of Canada also recognizes that the cost of living is putting financial pressure on Canadian families and small businesses. That is why we introduced many measures in the 2025 budget to help Canadians live a more dignified life. We cannot control what other countries do, but we can decide how we respond to what we can control. As the member opposite may recall, on our first day in office, we cancelled the divisive consumer carbon tax, which lowered gas prices by 18¢ per litre in most provinces and territories, except mine.

We are now cutting taxes for 22 million Canadians, saving a two-income family up to \$840 a year. We are also eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes up to \$1 million. That means savings of up to \$50,000 for many young families. That should also spur new home construction across the country.

We tabled budget 2025, entitled “Canada Strong”. This budget is a plan to transform our economy, one that currently depends on a single trading partner, into one that is stronger, more resilient, and more diversified. It is a plan that will empower Canadians and reduce the cost of living in this country. For example, the budget makes the national school food program permanent. That means an additional 400,000 children will receive healthy meals every day, and participating families with two children will be able to save about \$800 annually on groceries.

The budget also proposes to automatically deliver federal benefits to low-income Canadians. The CRA will ensure that they receive the federal benefits to which they are entitled, including those that they may not even be aware of.

The budget confirms a number of benefits. For example, the GST/HST credit provides up to \$700 for a couple this year, plus an additional \$184 for each child under the age of 19. The Canada child benefit amounts to \$8,000 this year for every child under the age of six, and \$6,700 for children between the ages of six and 17. All of these amounts will keep pace with the cost of living.

Another measure involves renewing the Canada strong pass, and the list goes on. We will also protect the vital social programs that Canadians rely on, whether it is child care, dental care or pharmaceutical. These are concrete measures that make life more affordable for Canadians.

[English]

Tako Van Popta: Madam Speaker, the member continues to use talking points from the Liberal Party: “We can't control inflation. It's something international. Other countries are doing it. We can't be responsible for what other countries do”. However, the government must be responsible for its own budgetary planning. I have been here for six years now, and I have heard many ministers of finance, one after the other, say that Canada's lagging productivity numbers are the fundamental problem for Canada's economy and the best way to fight inflation is for the economy to improve its productivity. I do not see anything in this budget that is going to do that.

Yes, the government is responsible for inflation in this country.

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Madam Speaker, the hon. member just illustrated very clearly the difference between our party and his. We believe that the current economic cycle is harsh and that it will not correct itself. We need to bring in concrete, meaningful measures and take definitive action on the economy. We will do this through substantial investments that will ultimately enable the economy to recover.

My hon. colleague is suggesting that there are no measures in this budget. I will simply mention the productivity superdeduction, which will allow businesses, starting this year, to deduct all their capital expenditures, industrial processing, research, testing and market development expenses. That is huge. I see that the government is moving in the right direction. I am confident, and I invite us to—

• (1855)

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

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

Lamoureux.....	4459
Tolmie.....	4459
Steinley.....	4459
Ma.....	4459
Lamoureux.....	4461
Roberts.....	4461
Leslie.....	4461
Greaves.....	4463
Garon.....	4463
Wagantall.....	4463
Wagantall.....	4464
Lamoureux.....	4465
Steinley.....	4466
Larouche.....	4466
Gill (Brampton West).....	4466
Lamoureux.....	4468
Larouche.....	4468
Hallan.....	4468
Caputo.....	4468

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Giving Tuesday	
Nguyen.....	4470
National Suicide Prevention Hotline	
Doherty.....	4470
Students in Winnipeg South Centre	
Carr.....	4470
Local Charities	
Shipley.....	4470
Growing Up with the Ursulines Exhibition	
Duclos.....	4471
Canadian Filipino Community	
Richards.....	4471
Youth Employment	
Sudds.....	4471
Food Security	
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt).....	4471
Jean-Claude Germain	
Ste-Marie.....	4472
Panamerican Optimist Championship	
Fancy.....	4472
Natural Resources	
Gallant.....	4472
2025 Queens of Harmony	
Clark.....	4472
Housing	
Mantle.....	4472
L'EntourElle	
Chatel.....	4473

Ethics	
Leslie.....	4473
Canada's Volunteer Award Winner	
Myles.....	4473

ORAL QUESTIONS

Official Languages	
Poilievre.....	4473
Carney.....	4473
Poilievre.....	4473
Carney.....	4474
Natural Resources	
Poilievre.....	4474
Carney.....	4474
Poilievre.....	4474
Carney.....	4474
Housing	
Poilievre.....	4474
Carney.....	4474
Poilievre.....	4474
Carney.....	4474
Intergovernmental Relations	
Blanchet.....	4475
Carney.....	4475
Blanchet.....	4475
Carney.....	4475
Blanchet.....	4475
Carney.....	4475
Housing	
Poilievre.....	4475
MacKinnon.....	4475
Poilievre.....	4476
Robertson.....	4476
Poilievre.....	4476
Hajdu.....	4476
Poilievre.....	4476
Robertson.....	4476
Poilievre.....	4476
MacKinnon.....	4477
Poilievre.....	4477
Hajdu.....	4477
Carbon Pricing	
Poilievre.....	4477
MacKinnon.....	4477
Official Languages	
Beaulieu.....	4477
Miller.....	4477
Champoux.....	4477
Miller.....	4478
Housing	
Aitchison.....	4478
Robertson.....	4478

Aitchison	4478
Robertson	4478
Rowe	4478
Thompson	4478
Ho	4478
Zerucelli	4479
Hardy	4479
Lightbound	4479
Justice	
Chang	4479
Sahota	4479
Steel and Aluminum Industry	
Dancho	4479
Joly	4479
International Trade	
Dancho	4480
Joly	4480
Diotte	4480
Joly	4480
Employment	
Vien	4480
Gainey	4480
Vien	4480
Lightbound	4480
Gill (Windsor West)	4481
van Koeverden	4481
Rood	4481
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	4481
Natural Resources	
Morin	4481
Alty	4481
Van Popta	4481
Hodgson	4481
Public Safety	
Saini	4482
Anandasangaree	4482
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Redekopp	4482
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	4482
Rempel Garner	4482
Diab	4482
Rempel Garner	4482
Anandasangaree	4483
Indigenous Affairs	
Earle	4483
Alty	4483
Official Languages	
Godin	4483
Miller	4483
The Environment	
Idlout	4483
Dabrusin	4483

Health	
Johns	4483
Hajdu	4483
House of Commons Procedure and Practice	
The Speaker	4484

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Second reading	4484
Caputo	4484
Lamoureux	4484
Blanchette-Joncas	4485
Vis	4485
Johns	4485
Allison	4485
Lamoureux	4487
Garon	4487
Rood	4488
Ste-Marie	4488
Desrochers	4490
Garon	4490
Desrochers	4490
Holman	4490
Lamoureux	4492
Garon	4492
Rood	4492
Shipley	4493
Lamoureux	4495
Dowdall	4495
Ste-Marie	4495
Doherty	4495
Lamoureux	4496
Garon	4497
Zimmer	4497
Jansen	4497
Lamoureux	4499
Blanchette-Joncas	4499
Steinley	4500
Kirkland	4500
Carr	4501
Garon	4502
Rood	4502
Hardy	4502
Lamoureux	4504
Garon	4504
Bonk	4504
Redekopp	4505

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Strategy on Flood and Drought Forecasting Act	
Bill C-241. Second reading	4506
Ramsay	4506
Lamoureux	4507

Vis	4508
Blanchette-Joncas	4510
Kronis	4511
Beaulieu	4512
Auguste	4513
Division on motion deferred	4514

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Finance

Mazier	4514
--------------	------

Ramsay	4514
--------------	------

Public Safety

Vis	4515
Ramsay	4516

The Economy

Van Popta	4517
Ramsay	4517

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>