



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 089
Wednesday, February 25, 2026

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, February 25, 2026

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

● (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: The member for Richmond Hill South will be leading us in the singing of the national anthem today.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

NORTH END WOMEN'S CENTRE

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Selkirk Avenue in Winnipeg Centre is home to some of the most vibrant community organizations, but it is also home to some of the highest instances of violence and disappearances of indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQA+ people. The North End Women's Centre is located right at ground zero of this crisis.

Particularly since the pandemic, its staff have reported an increase in gender-based violence. To answer these escalating challenges, the centre has applied three times for federal funding to expand its drop-in centre programming spaces and transitional housing units, something I have repeatedly written to the government to support. The government has left the centre without any indication as to whether it will fund these desperately needed supports.

We cannot wait when lives are on the line. I urge the government to act immediately to fund the North End Women's Centre and uphold community health and safety in Winnipeg Centre.

* * *

COLDEST NIGHT OF THE YEAR

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in Canadian communities, Coldest Night of the Year 2026, to support the hurting, hungry and homeless, is on the final stretch of its annual campaign. On Saturday, I will be walking alongside community members in support of Sources, an organization that has been providing help, encouragement and hope to people who are experiencing hurt, hunger and homelessness.

For me, this walk is about showing up. It is about reminding people that they are not invisible and that their community cares. I have been honoured to be the top fundraiser for two years and the leading fundraiser in the region for six years, thanks to the generosity and dedication of my teammates and donors.

I encourage all colleagues in the House to take part in the Coldest Night of the Year. It is free to join. Simply register to walk, start a team, or donate to my team. This weekend, send a simple but powerful message: in Canada, we care about each other.

* * *

● (1405)

RECOGNITION OF AN ENGAGED CITIZEN

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a young man from Saskatoon's Hampton Village, Tyrell Harder. Tyrell is the kind of neighbour who quietly makes our community stronger simply by showing up and serving others.

Raised right here in Saskatoon West, Tyrell is a proud graduate of Bedford Road Collegiate. For years, he has volunteered at the Bedford Road Invitational Tournament, giving his time so young athletes can compete, learn teamwork and build confidence. Tyrell has also worked and volunteered at Redberry Bible Camp, helping to create a positive, safe and welcoming environment for kids and families.

When our community needs engaged citizens, he steps up, volunteering during civic elections and as a campaign volunteer for me. He brings energy, reliability and a great attitude to everything. Today, Tyrell is working at the City Centre Church, helping the less advantaged. He does not look for recognition. He looks for ways to help. I am grateful for Tyrell's service, and I hope his example inspires others. We all need more Tyrells in our life.

*Statements by Members***GEORGE LEBLANC**

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Moncton—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, former mayor George LeBlanc, who passed away on February 3 after a long illness, was a leader in every way. We saw it through his charity work with great organizations like the Friends of The Moncton Hospital Foundation, The Moncton Hospital, Moncton Headstart and Moncton Youth Residences, to name just a few.

We saw it in his two decades serving on city council and, for eight of those years, being the mayor. Mayor LeBlanc led our city through an unprecedented building boom in our downtown, which still continues today. When a shooting rampage rocked our normally peaceful community, George articulated our grief and our strength to the nation. George LeBlanc led by example, with his honesty, his empathy and his quiet resolve to always make our city better.

I want to offer my deepest condolences to his wife Kathy, his son Jordan, his daughter Brittany, his grandchildren and also his extended family and friends. He will be missed. May he rest in peace.

* * *

LOWELL GREEN

Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that we learned of the passing of Canadian radio legend Lowell Green. Lowell started at Ottawa's CFRA in 1960, and by the time he retired over 50 years later, he had become North America's longest-running open-line talk show host.

Lowell will be remembered for promoting "common sense" and his "island of sanity", but it was not just the on-air achievements that made Lowell who he was. It was the many causes that he championed over the years. From launching a campaign to save the Centennial Flame here on Parliament Hill and a unity rally ahead of the 1995 referendum to being a co-founder of Big Brothers in Ottawa and the Help Santa Toy Parade, he truly made a difference in the lives of many people. He was awarded numerous accolades over the years by his peers, legions, Lions Clubs and other groups.

We lost Lowell this month at the age of 89. Our thoughts are with his family, his friends and his colleagues as we mourn and celebrate a life well lived.

* * *

*[Translation]***BLACK HISTORY MONTH**

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark Black History Month, a time when we come together to recognize the powerful contributions, resilience and legacy of Black communities across Canada and throughout the world.

On Monday, in my riding of Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, we took some time to discuss, reflect on and honour Black brilliance across generations, from today's nation builders to tomorrow's visionaries.

[English]

This month, schools, organizations and communities are coming together to share stories, highlight achievements and deepen our understanding of Black history in Canada. These celebrations are not only about the past. They are about building a future rooted in dignity, opportunity and shared progress.

Let this month be more than a commemoration. Let it inspire us to listen, to learn and to act. Let us honour the legacy of Black Canadians by advancing the work still before us and by ensuring that every person in every community can thrive.

* * *

HUMANITY AND MACHINES

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Ellianna Makanalani, my granddaughter, will be born in a few short months into a world where human thought has become mechanized.

Every day now, I wonder about the unique challenges she will experience because of it, what the societal impact will be and whether the value of the data she produces will come to outweigh the value of her labour. I wonder about the insecurity of knowing that thinking machines could bring automated war, the impact of the consolidation of wealth and power into the hands of the few who own them, and the blurring of what it means to be a human if humanity comes to rely on machines to reason for us.

I stand here today to warn my colleagues in this place that these are issues we cannot afford to ignore, and I pray that we will find a path for my granddaughter's generation that brings them peace, prosperity and justice. May they forgive us if we do not.

* * *

● (1410)

LUNAR NEW YEAR

Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we welcome the Lunar New Year, I send my warmest greetings to the Vietnamese Canadian community and to everyone celebrating across my riding of Spadina—Harbourfront.

The year of the horse calls us forward with energy, renewal and perseverance. It is a time to gather with family, honour our elders and reflect values such as resilience, generosity, learning and service. In recent weeks, I have had the privilege of celebrating with Vietnamese communities, from the Vietnamese Association of Toronto and the Vietnamese Women's Association of Toronto to the Waterfront Neighbourhood Centre's Lunar New Year celebrations and Small World Music's Chao Tet festival.

Each gathering reflects the pride, strength and cultural richness that Vietnamese Canadians bring to our country. As a proud daughter of this community, I remain deeply grateful to the generations whose sacrifices made greater representation possible. May this new year bring happiness, health and prosperity.

Chúc mừng năm mới.

* * *

HOUSING

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are tired of new titles and moving offices. They do not want more announcements. They want results. They want homes.

The government now proposes another federal housing body, but we already have the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Infrastructure Canada, the Department of Finance Canada and the Canada Lands Company all working on housing, land and financing.

If all these agencies already exist, what exactly would the new body do that the others cannot? Would it build homes faster? Would it cut permits? Would it remove taxes like the GST on new homes? No, it would simply add overhead and administrative delays.

Housing affordability will not improve by multiplying paperwork. It is time for the Liberal government to cut red tape, get out of the way and let builders build.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAYMOND BOUCHARD

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, another great actor has left us. Raymond Bouchard was a shining star in Quebec's cultural firmament. We will miss him more than words can say for his voice, his gift of the gab, and his generosity as an actor and as a person.

These extraordinary artists are irreplaceable. Every time we lose one of them, a wonderful era in Quebec's social and cultural history fades away little by little. It is sad.

Raymond Bouchard gave us unique characters like mayor Lesage in *La grande séduction* and Léo in *La Florida*. I am also thinking of his portrayal of Jacques Parizeau in the television series about Lévesque and his role as Paul Vézina in *Scoop*.

Raymond Bouchard was proud to be a Quebecker. Yes, he was a separatist, but above all, he was a great ambassador and a champion of the Quebec culture he held so dear.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I would like to express my sincere condolences to his family, friends and loved ones, as well as his fans, including myself.

I thank Raymond for everything.

* * *

[*English*]

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I rise to recognize the important contributions of Black Canadians and the work of the Black Business Association of BC. Surrey is home to the largest black population in our province.

Statements by Members

Black entrepreneurs are creating jobs, driving innovation and strengthening our economy, even as many face systemic barriers. Led by co-founders Nerissa Allen and Clavia Alleyne, the Black Business Association of BC is addressing these challenges. Through programs that support market access, regulatory compliance and international trade, they help businesses grow and compete globally.

By investing in equity and inclusion, we invest in Canada's future and build a stronger, more inclusive Canada.

Today is Pink Shirt Day. Let us stand against bullying and stand together in kindness.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just this morning I had a phone call from a friend of mine. She is a teacher, a government worker, but life is so unaffordable that her Internet is about to be cut tomorrow because she cannot keep up with Liberal inflation. She is not the only one. According to an RBC poll, 64% of millennials are worried about their financial future under the Prime Minister.

Many Canadians are bankrolling their debt into mortgages. Mortgage debt has now reached \$2.6 trillion. Unfortunately, millennials cannot do this, because they cannot afford a home. Nearly 60% of millennials do not even have enough money at the end of the month to pay their bills, let alone begin saving for a home.

Conservatives will continue to fight for an affordable Canada and a Canadian economy that creates powerful paycheques and lowers inflation so young people across our country can save for a home and save for a future.

* * *

● (1415)

MUSLIM COMMUNITIES IN NOVA SCOTIA

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, *as-salamu alaykum*.

Across the country, Muslim communities are celebrating Ramadan, a holy month of fasting, prayer and reflection.

I want to recognize the resiliency and generosity of Nova Scotia's Muslim communities, which demonstrate the strength that comes from unity and support.

I also want to highlight the important work of the Ummah Society, which recently received \$1.2 million from our government's youth gang prevention fund. This program is focused on keeping at-risk youth away from a life of crime.

Oral Questions

By providing mentorship and community resources, the gang busters project is helping to create safer, stronger communities for all of Nova Scotia.

I am proud to stand with Muslim communities and organizations like the Ummah Society during Ramadan as we work together for a more inclusive and safer Nova Scotia.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have created an immigration crisis that is straining housing, health care and jobs. As of January, non-permanent residents outnumbered unemployed Canadians, and the Liberals are expanding immigration streams that push our young people further away from employment.

Six million Canadians cannot find a family doctor, but taxpayers are now spending \$1 billion per year to cover the health care costs of refugee claimants, and the government has no clear plan for the nearly three million temporary residents whose permits are expiring this year.

Canadians deserve a competent immigration minister. The immigration minister's own caucus is not confident in her ability to handle these out-of-control problems.

It is time for decisive action. Only with strong leadership can we protect Canadians, prioritize jobs for our youth and secure a sustainable future for our country.

* * *

[Translation]

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Black History Month, I want to pay tribute to the people who make my community of Alfred-Pellan shine.

I want to thank Kardie Rosier, director of the Coumbite de Laval community centre, an organization that carries out essential work and is a true pillar of community support. I commend Ms. Rosier for her ongoing commitment to families and young people. I also want to acknowledge the involvement of Pastor Emmanuel Laurent and Father Claudel Petit-Homme, whose work helps reinforce social bonds and community wellness. I want to commend the invaluable contributions of Father Ronald Legerme and Marie Tessa Pierre, who provide help and support to those in need through their initiatives and dedication. I must not forget the outstanding commitment of Robert Alexandre, the most loyal friend and volunteer I could wish for. His perseverance and dedication are making a real difference in Alfred-Pellan.

I want to thank all these people for their commitment. What a perfect reflection of Canada's multicultural mosaic.

[English]

INTERIM FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian health care system is in crisis. Six million Canadians do not have a family doctor, and wait times have doubled over the past 10 years.

However, rather than putting Canadians' health first, the Liberal government's interim federal health program allows fraudulent and rejected asylum claimants to be bumped to the front of the line while Canadians pay for it. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says the IFHP will cost \$1.5 billion annually to pay for supplementary coverage like vision, counselling and home care. These are things that Canadians do not receive, yet Liberals make them pay for it. The fraudsters are taking advantage of our generosity.

Veterans who served our country and young people battling mental health crises are offered nothing by the Liberal government, but rejected refugees get tax-funded psychologists and therapists. A nation that refuses to put its own citizens first is deeply disturbing.

I urge the Liberals to reflect on what kind of message their vote will send to Canadians on the—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brampton South.

* * *

PINK SHIRT DAY

Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today on Pink Shirt Day, we stand together to send a clear message: Bullying in any form has no place in our communities.

Bullying has lasting impacts on mental health, academic success and overall well-being, affecting people of all ages. Our government will continue to invest in mental health supports such as Kids Help Phone, which provides immediate confidential support 24 hours a day. While these supports are essential, each of us can help foster a culture where seeking help is encouraged, stigma is reduced and kindness leads the way. Simple acts of compassion help build safer, more inclusive communities across Canada.

Everyone deserves to feel valued and supported and to know they have a safe space in our communities, because compassion and kindness are always stronger than hate.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1420)

[English]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Prime Minister said, "We have the immigration system under control", and his immigration minister said that her job is easy.

At the end of this year, there will be nearly three million people in Canada on expired or expiring visas. Last year, the Liberals managed to remove only 22,000 of them, and the Liberals are still issuing hundreds of thousands of new temporary work permits this year.

If the minister's job is so easy, what is her plan to get nearly three million people to leave?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the job that I have is never easy. It is one of the toughest jobs in government, and the reason is that many Canadians and many people are looking to our government to control immigration and to keep it sustainable.

With regard to the temporary residents, we have targets and we have ranges. People who are on temporary status have the opportunity to extend. They also have the opportunity to use some of our permanent pathways. Otherwise, they are expected to leave.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the immigration minister has been in her job for a year now, and since she was appointed, we have been hearing disgusting stories every other week about non-citizens convicted of serious crimes getting leniency in order to avoid deportation. The minister could have been lobbying her cabinet colleagues to make sure that laws are changed and that victims get the justice that they deserve, but she has done nothing.

If the Prime Minister wants to move at a scale and speed not seen in generations, why does he not just fire his failed minister now?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my record of work on immigration speaks for itself. We are taking back control of the immigration system. We are returning immigration to sustainable levels. Our asylum levels are down by a third. The number of international students is down by a third. The number of temporary foreign workers is down by a half. We have exceeded our francophone immigration targets. We are bringing global talents. From July to October 2025, the population of Canada decreased slightly. We are on track, and we have met all our targets.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister's record sure does speak for itself. In fact, 10 Liberal members of Parliament had comments on her record today. They were quoted in a CBC article saying what millions of Canadians already know: that the Prime Minister's immigration minister is not getting her job done. She will not take basic meetings, processing times have not been fixed and the asylum backlog has ballooned to 300,000 people under her watch. I have said it before, and I will say it again: She is a bad minister.

If the Liberal caucus does not even think she should have her job, why is the Prime Minister still defending her?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are building an immigration system that keeps Canada strong. That is our mission. That is our mandate. That is what Canadians elected us to do. That is what we will continue to do.

In June, we introduced legislation, Bill C-2, to protect the asylum system against sudden increases in claims. The Conservatives op-

Oral Questions

posed it. In October, we brought forward new legislation, Bill C-12, that would protect our borders and strengthen the immigration system. The Conservatives have delayed it at every stage.

We are building an immigration system that is sustainable and that will keep Canada strong.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the CBC reported what we all see every day: that the immigration minister's own Liberal colleagues cringe awkwardly as she fumbles her way through serious issues. I have had the misfortune of sitting across from her at immigration committee, where she cannot answer basic questions about bills that she has presented to Parliament. While her infamous salad quote was admittedly crazy, the immigration portfolio is no laughing matter.

Under a Conservative government, Canada's immigration system functioned well. It was fair and orderly, but it is not with the current minister. Why does she still have her job?

• (1425)

[Translation]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to immigration, the government has reduced the number of asylum claims by one-third. The number of international students in Canada has fallen by one-third. From July to October 2025, Canada's population declined slightly after several years. We have increased economic immigration to 64% in order to attract world-class talent.

We are building a strong immigration system and a strong Canada.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister said that the immigration system was under control. However, the Liberals have broken our immigration system. Here are the facts: 86,000 bogus refugee claimants are still in Canada. More than 33,000 are still wanted by the Canada Border Services Agency. Worse still, 25,000 asylum seekers were accepted without any security checks. In addition, the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship is not even capable of understanding her files. Meanwhile, there are nearly 200,000 asylum seekers in Quebec putting pressure on our health care system and our schools.

Will the Prime Minister take responsibility and fire the minister?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are proud to serve with this Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship. We are proud of our immigration track record. We are proud that she is the first Lebanese woman to hold this position. She has a background in public service that includes serving as a minister and an MP in Nova Scotia and as a minister here. The results speak for themselves: Asylum claims are down by a third. The number of international students has dropped by a third. From July to October, Canada's population has decreased. This minister is doing her job.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is not personal. It is professional. Clearly, this minister does not understand her file. Ten of her colleagues told the French CBC that the minister was not familiar with her files and that she was incompetent. We need a minister who can grasp what is going on in Canada to manage immigration.

Will the Prime Minister show some backbone and fire her?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are the ones who cannot answer questions on immigration. They have no immigration policy and, after a week of careful consideration, they decided to come back to the House and attack the most vulnerable, specifically refugees and asylum seekers. Just think about this: They want to deny health care to a child who has just arrived in Canada and who was injured during the war in Ukraine. It is the Conservatives who have no immigration policy. We are proud of our minister. We are proud of our record. The Conservatives need to stand up and take responsibility.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Cúram software and its \$5 billion in cost overruns is the last straw for Quebec. The Quebec National Assembly just unanimously adopted a motion that points out that significant cost overruns in federal government IT projects are a waste of the tax dollars paid by Quebec taxpayers. Every elected official in Quebec is calling on the federal government to launch an independent public inquiry into federal IT contracts.

When will the government launch this inquiry that has been unanimously requested by Quebec?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the modernization of the government is an ongoing process that is bearing fruit in terms of old age security payments. Today, we are serving more than seven million Canadians with a new, modernized system that has replaced a very outdated 60-year-old system. This project is in the budgets and is part of a much broader modernization of all Government of Canada benefits.

• (1430)

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec National Assembly unanimously adopted a motion pointing out that the cost of the Phoenix software skyrocketed from an initial budget of \$309 million to a total cost of \$5.5 billion. It also noted

that the cost of ArriveCAN went from \$80,000 to \$60 million and that now, Cúram has already exceeded its initial budget of \$1.75 billion to reach \$6.6 billion. Meanwhile, the Liberals are still denying that there are any cost overruns for Cúram, even though the Auditor General herself reported four in 2025.

What we are asking and what Quebec is asking is this: When will the government call an independent public inquiry?

[English]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times they say things, it will not make them true. In fact, the Cúram software program is actually under—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I cannot hear the answer. We will let the hon. minister answer the question.

The hon. Minister of Jobs and Families may continue.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Mr. Speaker, over and over, we have heard that number, which is patently wrong. I have no other way to say it.

This is the largest transformation of the way we deliver benefits in the history of this country. We are moving three important benefit programs from paper-based, old school technology to full modernization, where people will be able to and are right now able to apply online. This is the —

The Speaker: The hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

[Translation]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if I were the minister, I would not be attacking the Auditor General's credibility. We are seeing the same unacceptable flippancy from the Liberals. They are burying their heads in the sand and continuing to spend taxpayers' money.

The Quebec National Assembly is reminding us that, in just three IT projects, Ottawa has wasted over \$10 billion in cost overruns. With that kind of money, the Government of Quebec could fix up 227 rundown hospitals and still have plenty left over. There is still no accountability in Ottawa. The Liberals keep saying that there are no cost overruns.

When will they call an independent public inquiry?

[English]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, 7.7 million seniors have been transitioned to this new software. There are still some seniors who have applied for their benefits and are waiting. That number is dropping every week, every month, as we anticipate it will continue to do.

Our officials are working very hard, night and day, to make sure that all cases are resolved. If the member opposite has a person in his riding who needs urgent attention, I suggest he share that name with me or have them call Service Canada. We have not received any names yet from that member of Parliament.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal immigration minister is out of her depth and the numbers prove it. Eighty-six per cent of rejected asylum seekers remain in Canada, while 25,000 people were admitted without a proper security screening and nearly three million temporary visa holders are nearing expiry with no clear plan in place.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister claimed that the system is “under control”, but there are no real controls left. The Liberals dismantled them and the minister has shown no ability to restore order. With results like these, why is she still in her job?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will park some of the factual inaccuracies that were included in the member's question.

However, let me just take a moment to say that I have been proud to work alongside my colleague from Nova Scotia, not just in her current capacity as the Minister of Immigration for Canada but previously when she served as the immigration minister in my home province of Nova Scotia. She was uniquely responsible for bringing in the health care workers who provided care to my neighbours. She was uniquely responsible in helping resettle refugees from Syria when the federal Conservatives would not lift a finger. She is working on a program that may be a difficult problem to solve, but she is restoring integrity to the immigration system and the personal attacks are cruel, inappropriate and beneath this House.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is that minister who left the immigration minister with the mess that she has to clean up. He knows that even Liberal MPs who have been passed over for a decade can see that she is out of her depth because of the mess that he left. These are direct quotes from them: “[She] has no idea how to respond”, “It doesn't make sense” and “she'll put her foot in her mouth.”

At what point will the Prime Minister acknowledge that this file requires real leadership and a serious course correction without the two of them?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr.

Oral Questions

Speaker, we see what the Conservatives are doing here by pitting Canadians against asylum seekers. Some of them helped us during COVID, yet Conservatives are deliberately confusing fraudulent claimants and failed asylum claimants. This is not a dog whistle. It is a foghorn.

I know it is Lent, so I implore them to show a little grace. Instead of shedding MPs for Lent, which we appreciate, maybe they need to shed this line of questioning.

● (1435)

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they just put up a third failed immigration minister to answer the question. This is actually a really serious issue.

They can talk down members of the House. They can call them bad people all they want, but Canada's immigration consensus is crumbling. Stakeholders are not getting their calls returned. Controls are gone, putting pressure on housing, on health care and on jobs, while the minister is MIA throughout all of it. The House deserves a straight answer. When is she getting fired?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us assume for a second that the Conservatives actually want to help the situation. Perhaps the member opposite can turn to her right, talk to the Leader of the Opposition, who has changed so many ridings he is Parliament's own temporary foreign worker, and ask him to stop going around the country pandering to communities, promising them not to be deported and promising visas for everyone. That might help.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they are putting up all the previous failed immigration ministers to speak for her.

The Liberal Prime Minister has created a sentencing discount system—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The member can start from the top.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has created a sentencing discount system for foreign criminals. The Prime Minister claims that they have the system under control.

Let us look at the case of Rajbir Singh. This criminal sexually assaulted a young woman and received a conditional discharge so he would not have a criminal conviction registered against him so he could stay in the country. Under the Liberal Prime Minister's sentencing discount policy, not only are dangerous criminals allowed to stay in the country, but they get released early.

When will the Prime Minister fire his immigration minister, or does he think that she has it all under control?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the assertion of the member of the opposition party is absolutely false. When somebody is before the courts facing criminal charges and conviction, they are deemed to be inadmissible to Canada. The Canada Border Services Agency takes this very seriously and has inadmissible individuals removed. Last year, we removed over 22,000 individuals from Canada.

However, let me be very clear. The issue of lawful access is a tool that law enforcement has been asking for. The party opposite has absolutely failed in supporting those policies so that we can have a safer country.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if they had confidence in the immigration minister, then she would be answering these questions herself.

Let us take a look at another case. Joyson Lewis assaulted his girlfriend. He grabbed her, tearing her shirt in the process, threw her to the ground and hit her again. The judge in the case sentenced this foreign criminal to nine months of probation specifically so that the conviction would not be entered into the record and he could stay in Canada.

Why is the Liberal government doubling down on a policy that gives sentencing discounts to foreign criminals, and when will the Prime Minister fire the minister?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a rule of law country, one that respects the rule of law. Nobody is above the law. The discounts that the member is talking about are absolutely false. What I will say is that the Canada Border Services Agency removes those who are inadmissible to Canada, those with criminal penalties.

Let me also be very clear that the party opposite absolutely refuses to move on lawful access, a tool that law enforcement has been asking for from coast to coast to coast. This is the record that the party has in terms of defending the rights of Canadians and keeping Canada safer.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by the end of this year, three million temporary residents will have had their visas expire, and the government has no enforcement plan to ensure that they leave. Last year alone, 1.5 million permits expired, and the Liberals just simply assumed they would magically comply. The system is out of control. Housing is strained. Youth unemployment is rising. Our health care system is broken. Canadians are clearly paying the price.

When will the Prime Minister take responsibility for this failure and fire his immigration minister?

• (1440)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been getting the immigration system under control. Bill C-12 is about to pass through the Senate. This will not allow people to abuse our asylum system.

If they cared so much about crime, they would have passed Bill C-14 a long time ago. We could have passed that bill back at Christmastime. There are 80 different changes to the Criminal Code

of Canada. We are strengthening our Criminal Code more than we have seen in generations.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, competence is not talking points. It is measured by results.

The 33,000 non-citizens listed as wanted by the CBSA is not competent. When 86% of rejected asylum claimants remain in Canada, that is not compassion. That is a system that is not being enforced. The minister has lost control of the file and the confidence of stakeholders. Now members of her own caucus are questioning her ability, and Canadians are paying the price.

Once again, will the Prime Minister take responsibility for this failure and fire his immigration minister?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives really cared about these issues, they would support us and the responsible legislation we are putting forward. We are bringing down asylum numbers in this country and we are reducing fraud in our system, with the leadership of the immigration minister.

If the Conservatives cared, they would stop their divisive politics and hate tactics, they would join us in making sure that legislation passes swiftly through the House, and they would stop the obstruction.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORTATION

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have cut \$5 billion from public transit. That means \$5 billion less in a fund that has yet to provide a single penny to Quebec, while Ontario and the western provinces are stuffing their pockets.

Strangely enough, \$5 billion is the same amount as the Cúram cost overrun. That means \$5 billion more for companies that are blowing the budget on underperforming software, and \$5 billion less for public transit projects.

Why are the Liberals not investing more money in Quebecers in Quebec instead of making their consultants rich?

[*English*]

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the good news is that we have the build communities strong fund, which includes public transit. This is a \$51-billion infrastructure fund that the House has the opportunity to support in the budget implementation act. It is \$51 billion, and a significant percentage of that applies to public transit.

We are in talks with the Government of Quebec to pursue the opportunity for public transit investment. We hope to conclude those negotiations and be able to make ongoing investments in public transit across Quebec, as we have across the country.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the \$5-billion cut to the Canada public transit fund is unacceptable.

Alliance TRANSIT denounced it this morning, and the cities have too. A coalition of organizations such as Équiterre, Trajectoire Québec, Vivre en Ville and many others is accusing the federal government of causing harm to users, to public transit, to mobility and to the government's own climate objectives. Worse still, Quebec has yet to receive a penny from this fund, while Ontario and Vancouver are raking in money.

Are the Liberals going to cancel their budget cut and make sure that Quebec finally receives its share?

[English]

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are ready to pursue public transit investment with the Government of Quebec. We are at the table. We are negotiating. We welcome the opportunity to invest. There are significant dollars available in the build communities strong fund. When the BIA is passed, we will be able to move that funding through, on top of the \$25 billion that is available in the Canada public transit fund. Add all that up and there is a significant increase to the public transit funding that is available, and there is more flexibility for provinces and territories and cities to pursue.

* * *

JUSTICE

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister falsely claims he has our immigration system under control, but when a non-Canadian on a student visa can spy on his female housemates for six months and not get deported, Canadians know the system is out of control. He recorded them in various states of undress. He recorded them using the bathroom, but instead of protecting these women, Liberal sentencing discounts allow immigration consequences to benefit the offender.

When did the Liberals abandon vulnerable women, and when will the Prime Minister finally take accountability and fire his immigration minister?

• (1445)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is completely the opposite. The Conservatives would like Canadians to believe that there is some policy in place. There is no policy in place. The provinces should respond for those types of actions that are happening in provincial criminal courts. It is not federal policy. If anything, we are strengthening the Criminal Code of Canada to make sure that criminals face the penalties they should for these outrageous crimes.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not an answer, and this is not isolated. When a non-citizen can sexually assault someone's 18-year-old daughter twice and not

Oral Questions

be deported, the system is out of control. This offender was found guilty of sexual assault. The judge knew he would be deported, but then they gave him a discharge and probation, so another criminal stays in Canada.

The Liberals accuse us of all kinds of things, but their judges are pleading down at the expense of our daughters, so I will ask again: When will the Prime Minister fire his immigration minister and get immigration back under control?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these are not our judges. These are Canadian judges appointed by provinces. Our criminal court hearings happen at the provincial level.

Conservatives would like Canadians to believe that there is some type of federal policy that is making judges make these decisions. There is absolutely no such policy. If anything, we are tightening the Criminal Code of Canada. In Bill C-16 and Bill C-14, we are making sure that we support victims of sexual assault and that we make conditional sentences no longer a thing.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister said that the immigration system is under control. I am sorry, but contrary to what the Prime Minister says, things are not going well at all. Quebec alone has taken in 200,000 asylum seekers. That puts pressure on the health care, education and child care systems.

This morning, we learned from a Radio-Canada article that the Liberal Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship does not have a strong grasp of her portfolio and is completely unreachable.

Will the Prime Minister take responsibility and fire the immigration minister?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, because this question has already been asked multiple times today and has been answered by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship and other colleagues of mine, asylum claims have decreased by a third under this minister. The number of international students in Canada has dropped by a third under this minister. In addition, between July and October 2025, Canada's population actually declined slightly after many years of growth. That is the record of this immigration minister.

What is the Conservative Party's policy on this?

*Oral Questions***PENSIONS**

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have been rising here in the House to discuss the Cúram software for weeks now. The cost of this IT project has ballooned from \$1.6 billion to \$6.6 billion. That is a \$5-billion cost overrun. Some 78,000 seniors are waiting for their benefits. We have asked the Liberal government dozens of questions, but we are not getting any answers.

Yesterday, I asked if there was anyone in the Liberal cabinet who would take responsibility for this file, who would also bang on their desk and promise to take care of it. This is unacceptable. Canadians are the ones paying out of their own pockets. This is a waste of money.

What is the Liberal government going to do?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that the member opposite is saying that he has asked who to speak to. I have said about 15 times, members should come and speak to me directly if they have cases that they need accelerated.

I have also been very clear in the House that this is a massive transformation of software. We have a portfolio of money allotted to us to do that transformation, and in fact we are under budget.

If the member opposite needs to be briefed, I ask him to come to me immediately after question period, and I will talk to him.

* * *

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberal Prime Minister said that the immigration system was under control, yet the Liberals have abandoned security checks and systematic screening processes and have allowed approximately 25,000 people into the country without even having to talk to a government employee. Meanwhile, where is the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship?

She is not answering any questions. The situation is so serious that even Liberal MPs are calling for her to resign.

Can the Prime Minister step up to the plate and finally fire his Liberal immigration minister?

[*English*]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear about the facts. Officers rigorously review each and every claim before it reaches the IRB, and nobody can claim asylum in Canada without questioning.

To keep Canadians safe, CBSA does the front-end security screening on all adult refugee claimants. There is no rubber-stamping of any files or any claims. Each one is assessed individually on the merits by highly trained decision-makers.

The government worked hard to bring asylum claims down by more than a third last year. We will keep working hard to do that. We have Bill C-12 in front of us.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that Canadian workers are the backbone of a strong economy. The government's new workforce alliances are bringing together workers, industry and training partners to build the skilled and resilient workforce that Canada needs for the future. Now more than before, Canadian workers need their government to have their backs.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families tell the House how the government is supporting workers and strengthening the Canadian economy now and in the future?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member of Parliament for Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma is a force to be reckoned with. In fact, it was such an honour to stand with him at the Algoma steel mill to support the defence of Canadian-made steel. I want to thank him for his ongoing advocacy. It was a very proud moment for me to announce five additional workforce alliances. These are something the industry has been calling for for a very long time and a way to streamline skills training with the needs of the industry. I am so thrilled that we are working strongly with workers and employers across this country to build Canada strong.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister falsely stated that he had the immigration system under control. Does he realize his own immigration department is rubber-stamping asylum claims from terrorist-sponsoring countries like Afghanistan, Yemen and Iran? We just heard that the minister does not even realize that she is auto-approving claims from Pakistan, one of whose nationals was trying to claim asylum when he was arrested in Quebec for allegedly plotting a terrorist attack against Jews in New York City. This incompetence hurts legitimate refugees and all Canadians. Now even his own caucus is calling for the Prime Minister's hand-picked immigration hire to be fired.

When will the Prime Minister wake up and fire this immigration minister?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every file for asylum comes through a very rigorous security check, both through CBSA and through CSIS. Our law enforcement works every single day to keep Canadians safe. The rigorous process to ensure that those who are inadmissible are deemed to be inadmissible and are removed is something that our law enforcement agencies do each and every day. The assertions made by the opposition are absolutely false.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is embarrassing. The ministers do not even know how their own system works. Yesterday, the Prime Minister falsely claimed he had the immigration system under control. He blindly expressed full confidence in his immigration minister.

These are the facts: 300,000 asylum claims, a four-year backlog, nearly three million temporary residents with expiring permits and no plan to remove them, auto-approving asylum claims from terrorist-sponsoring countries without any human intervention.

Ask any Canadian. Immigration is far from under control. Now even Liberal MPs are questioning her place at the cabinet table, so will the Prime Minister finally wake up, listen to his own MPs and fire his incompetent immigration minister?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I can say is that we have a robust refugee protection system that ensures the safety and security of Canadians. First and foremost, we have a system through the Immigration and Refugee Board whereby every single file is assessed for its merits and its compliance with the refugee convention of 1951.

Secondly, before somebody is granted permanent residency, there is a vigorous security check, which enables Canada to ensure the safety and security of Canadians, from our law enforcement agencies, including CSIS and the Canada Border Services Agency. The assertions made by—

• (1455)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Riding Mountain.

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I asked the immigration minister at health committee how many more patients our health care system could handle. She laughed and then said it was not a fair question for immigration. She said it was not a fair question, but six million Canadians do not have a doctor. People are dying waiting for care. Our system is at capacity, and she does not even know it. If the minister setting immigration levels does not think health care capacity is her business, then she has no business being minister.

Will the Prime Minister fire her today?

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has the values to which the world aspires. We have always been and always will be committed to fundamental rights and human dignity. We believe in our universal health care system. Let us not play politics at the expense of asylum seekers. As I just said, we must build a better health care system, and we are doing it working with provinces and territories.

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal immigration minister falsely told the health committee that rejected asylum claimants lose the premium health benefits her government

provides, but she was wrong. In fact, her own department had to correct her. Rejected claimants remain fully eligible for premium health benefits like physiotherapy and home care under the interim federal health program.

A minister who does not know her own program has no business running it. Will the Prime Minister take accountability and fire his immigration minister?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleague that health services are the responsibility of the provinces and territories, not the federal government. The Minister of Health and the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship have a duty to work with the provinces and territories on services.

As members know, the immigration minister has nothing to do with those providing services on the ground.

[*English*]

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada's immigration system is broken, and the Liberal immigration minister is treating this critical file like a game of hide-and-seek. She is not very good at hiding, but the Liberals are very good at deflecting. Even her own Liberal colleagues have called out her abject incompetence.

As the minister tries to hide, Canadians are left witnessing a youth unemployment crisis and three million temporary resident visas expiring in 2026. Will this minister stop playing games and start taking responsibility for the mess that she and the Liberals have created?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear, without there being much substance to the question put on the floor, that the Conservatives have decided, for political reasons, to try to use immigration as a wedge issue in Canadian politics. They could be using their questions to focus on the Canada-U.S. relationship. They could be using them to focus on how we can improve health care or how we can grow the economy, but no.

For the more than 10 years that I have been elected as a member of Parliament, time and time again, when things get tough, the Conservatives pivot to attacking newcomers. We are dealing with, in some instances, some of the most vulnerable people in the world. I wish we could focus on some of—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

There is a lot of noise coming from one side, from the end over there. I have my eye on a certain member, but there is a lot of noise coming from that side.

Oral Questions

The hon. minister may continue, but I will ask members to please keep it down.

Hon. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude very quickly.

This is a time for thoughtful debate on policy solutions that will advance the country's interest, not a time for immature name-calling.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago, the Liberal election platform promised that the federal deficit would be limited to an already eye-popping \$62 billion. That deficit exploded to \$78 billion in the fall, with billions more added since. Our federal debt is now nearly two and a half times what it was just a decade ago. Meanwhile, the Toronto Star is warning this morning that Canadian household debt has risen to a record \$2.6 trillion.

How have we gone, in just a decade, from a country with a balanced budget and the richest middle class in the world to a country where Canadians are taking on record personal debt to pay off the bills passed down to them by their own federal government?

• (1500)

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the debt and deficit are fiscally sustainable. The IMF has testified to that fact, and the Bank of Canada has testified to that fact.

We continue to put in measures, of course, to build up the economy, and an opportunities agenda is exactly what this country needs right now. We have seen the government moving ahead to ensure that the resources of this country get to market, to build up infrastructure and to make sure that this country can compete on a global level in a changing international landscape.

If Conservatives want to be serious, they can join us in those initiatives by pursuing policies that are thoughtful, or they can keep playing games.

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals' new leadership, Canada's multifront economic crisis has gotten objectively worse. The Liberal Prime Minister himself promised the \$62-billion deficit. Their own budget shattered that promise, adding \$16 billion in new debt, and they have added billions more in recent weeks. Young Canadians are taking on record personal debt to pay the bill. According to RBC, "64% of Millennials are anxious about their financial future as monthly costs squeeze budgets".

Which Liberal minister will stand now to explain to those young Canadians why they should take on more personal liability and stress to cover ever-increasing Liberal debt?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Conservatives never tell us what they would cut. If they want to pursue this line of questioning, it is logical that they would go to another issue.

Would they cut the Canada child benefit? They would. Would they cut child care? They certainly would. Would they cut pharmaceutical? They certainly would do that. Would they cut the school food program, which we want to make permanent? They would do that. Would they not support these measures? They never have, and they never will.

What about a long-term focus, an opportunities agenda, jobs and a focus on families and youth? All those things are at stake, and we are pursuing exactly that. They should join us.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, millennials were told that, if we worked hard, played by the rules and planned for the future, we could build a stable life here in Canada, but a recent RBC poll shows that 57% have nothing left after paying their monthly bills and 4 in 10 believe that they may never be debt-free.

After years of soaring housing costs, persistent inflation and higher taxes, my generation is carrying record personal debt while also being handed the Liberal government's debt to pay for. When will the Liberals stop loading debt onto our generation so young Canadians can build a life, and not just—

The Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State for Sport.

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives are demonstrating that they have no credibility on affordability because they are ignoring all of the recommendations that the experts are making to pursue a more equitable future in Canada. One of the recommendations the Conservatives chose to ignore was the groceries and essentials benefit. We are using a proven mechanism to provide relief to families in those income brackets that need it most with the rising cost of living. The Conservatives can quote the experts if they want to, but I recommend they follow the recommendations as well.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are tired of political talking points. The Liberals must have the humility to face the reality. Young Canadians are not falling behind by accident. They are being pushed behind by Liberal policies, and they are not asking for programs. Talk to a millennial. They are asking the Liberals to get out of the way today.

TransUnion Canada reported that household debt reached \$2.6 trillion by the end of 2025. Families are living paycheque to paycheque, just to keep a roof over their heads. When will the Liberal government realize it cannot spend its way to affordability and finally focus on bringing down the—

The Speaker: The hon. secretary of state.

Oral Questions

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a bit ironic to be criticized about political talking points when the members opposite read from the same page over and over again. They ask the same 15 questions over and over again. They do not write their own questions. There is no creativity from that side. The level of this debate deserves a bit more.

With respect to housing, we have invested \$13 billion in non-market housing through Build Canada Homes. After a successful \$1.5-billion pilot on co-op housing, we see these strategies are working. Rents are coming down and home ownership is within sight for young people. That is because of the policies of the government.

The Conservatives have a choice. They can get on board or—

The Speaker: The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets.

* * *

• (1505)

INDUSTRY

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in South Shore—St. Margarets, Hawboldt Industries is one of the companies in my riding that is proving that advanced manufacturing for defence is not just an urban story, but is very much a rural one. Rural communities have the talent and the capacity to help Canada meet its defence needs.

Can the Secretary of State for Defence Procurement explain how the new defence industrial strategy will expand opportunities for rural manufacturers such as Hawboldt and create good-paying jobs for all Canadians?

Hon. Stephen Fuhr (Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for South Shore—St. Margarets for her advocacy for Nova Scotia's manufacturers, such as Hawboldt Industries. Companies like this prove that advanced defence manufacturing is thriving in rural Canada.

Our defence industrial strategy makes procurement a driver of growth. In Atlantic Canada, the sector supports 10,000 good-paying jobs. Through a defence investment agency, at least 70% of our defence spending will focus on generating jobs and investments here at home. That makes work in communities like Chester and allows faster delivery for equipment to the Canadian Armed Forces.

* * *

HOUSING

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hope of ever owning a home is slipping away for young Canadians. Nearly half of young Canadians are being forced to move out of the communities they grew up in because they can no longer afford the Liberal housing hell.

From 2019 to 2024, for every 100 new adults added to our population, there were only 12 housing starts intended for ownership. This is less than half the pace of previous decades. Now, a new CIBC report confirms what young Canadians already know: Homes are still too expensive to buy and not profitable to build.

After years of Liberal rhetoric and red tape, when will the government finally scrap the GST on all new homes and let young Canadians build a life?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the good news is that there is a tax break coming for first-time homebuyers. I thank members of the House for standing up for our young people. We are now seeing prices starting to come down, rents coming down and home prices coming down. We see that in the new CMHC housing affordability index report that came out this morning.

The trend is in the right direction, but we have to double down. We have to focus on delivering Build Canada Homes' \$13 billion for affordable housing. We have to make sure that the entire House is committed to bringing down the price of housing for young Canadians.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, instead of laying foundations for homes, the Liberal government is laying foundations for another bureaucracy.

The Liberal Prime Minister promised to build at a pace not seen since the Second World War, yet a recent report from the government's own housing agency says that homebuilding is expected to drop in each of the next three years, with housing starts in 2028 falling as much as 18% compared to last year. That is 55% below what is necessary to meet the Prime Minister's own targets.

Instead of building homes, they are building roadblocks with a fourth Liberal housing bureaucracy. When will the Liberals finally admit that they themselves are the problem?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our next steps are critical. The next step that the member can take is supporting the Build Canada Homes act to make sure that the government has every tool available to invest in affordable housing. We have \$13 billion labelled for non-market housing. That will leverage tens of thousands of units of affordable housing, from rental to affordable home ownership.

We need everybody on board with this. This is not a time to take potshots and not a time to fall back on the failed record of the Conservatives on housing.

Oral Questions

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a new report from CIBC confirms what young Canadians already know: The dream of home ownership is slipping away. In fact, the bank says prices are too high to buy and that the average down payment in Ontario is now nearly \$300,000. That is an impossible number. Behind that number is a young family who cannot buy a home, start a family or build a life. The bank says that, unless we cut the cost of homes, things will only get worse.

Our suggestion is to cut the cost of GST on all new homes. Will the housing minister agree to that?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, forgive us if Canadians recognize that that party has no credibility when it comes to housing. Their leader called middle-class housing shacks and said co-op housing was Soviet-style. That member mocked modular housing. The leader even called on his MPs to boycott the housing accelerator fund, which would have actually helped in their ridings.

On this side of the House, we are serious about getting houses built. That party is just full of obstruction and rhetoric.

* * *

• (1510)

[Translation]

FAMILIES, CHILDREN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, at the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, our government again tried to move a motion to study the national school food program, after hearing credible witnesses talk about its positive impact on children and their families.

However, the Conservative members spent the meeting filibustering and denying that food security is linked to affordability, climate impacts and the idea that families should not have to worry about whether their children remembered to bring their lunch, whether they ate enough, or whether they had full bellies.

Can the Secretary of State for Children and Youth tell the House how this program helps children eat well and families worry less?

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie for the question. It is true that if the Conservative Party wants to talk about food security, it should support the national school food program.

A new study by the Breakfast Club of Canada notes that when children are well fed at school, academic results improve, children's health improves, and families spend less on groceries. While Conservative members are obstructing progress, we are listening to families and experts.

[English]

JUSTICE

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, Peel police charged four men with sex trafficking girls as young as 11 years of age, yet within 24 hours, these disgusting criminals were released on Liberal bail. Let that sink in. Grown men charged with exploiting young girls are now walking free. This is an absolute disgrace. This is what a broken justice system looks like. Enough is enough.

When will the government stop coddling the worst criminals in our society and finally stand on the side of innocent children?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just today I was with Peel Regional Police at a human trafficking symposium. We talked about these issues with survivors. It is really important that criminals of this type, who have committed this heinous crime, get the sentences they deserve. That is why we brought in bail reform.

Had the Conservatives co-operated, we could have had it passed before Christmas, but they chose to obstruct. I am glad to see that the legislation is now progressing, and we can put an end to the revolving door.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people are meeting with government officials to discuss safety in communities impacted by resource extraction, yet this follows a budget that included zero funding for MMIWG and the Liberals' exclusion of indigenous women from the development of Bill C-5, despite the high rates of violence around these projects.

Will the government mandate enforceable community safety plans for corporations and restore funding to address this ongoing crisis?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we owe it to survivors and to the people we have lost to act and to prevent gender-based violence. As we advance these major projects, we are working with communities to protect women, girls and gender-diverse people. Through our national action plan, we are strengthening prevention and ensuring that survivors can access those supports.

This is how we ensure that progress never comes at the expense of the safety of women and girls in our country.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

The Speaker: I would like to take a moment to bring to my colleagues' attention a very important anniversary this week: the 150th anniversary of the Library of Parliament.

[Translation]

For 150 years, parliamentarians have been able to count on this wealth of information, knowledge and expertise. I think that all members appreciate the exceptional services provided to us day after day by the Library of Parliament staff. With intelligence, professionalism and innovation, this institution has evolved over the years to provide us with the information we need to serve our constituents and our country as best we can. In a political workplace where change and unpredictability are the norm, we count on the cool heads, diplomacy and wisdom of the staff at the Library of Parliament.

• (1515)

[English]

For the last 150 years, the library has evolved and innovated to meet the changing needs of Parliament. The days when the library's services were centred on a collection of books, journals and reference works is long gone. Today, thanks to technology, the walls of the library have disappeared, and parliamentarians can access its resources wherever they are and whenever they want. Dynamic, digital and highly specialized, the Library of Parliament has risen to the challenge of meeting the needs of modern parliamentary democracy.

[Translation]

At the heart of the library's evolution are the people who make that possible. Generations of librarians, researchers and numerous other specialists have worked tirelessly to ensure that parliamentarians get the information they need, when they need it.

[English]

From preparing in-depth research briefings and legislative summaries to answering urgent reference questions, helping with speeches, and guiding senators and members of Parliament through complex data and historical records, library employees provide expertise across a remarkable range of subjects. Their commitment to accuracy, impartiality and service ensures that Parliament can function with knowledge and confidence.

As we celebrate the library's 150th anniversary, we honour not only the building itself but also the extraordinary staff whose skill and dedication have sustained this institution for a century and a half. On behalf of the House, I express the deepest gratitude of its members to the Library of Parliament for the excellence of its services, which continue to inspire, inform and support parliamentarians.

Business of Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—INTERIM FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAM

The House resumed from February 24 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:17 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Calgary Nose Hill relating to the business of supply.

[Translation]

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is as follows.

May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (1530)

[English]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 72)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Block	Bonk
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Chambers	Cobena
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Deltell
DeRidder	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kibble
Kirkland	Kmiec
Konanz	Kram

Business of Supply

Kramp-Neuman	Kronis	Fuhr	Gaheer
Kuruc	Kusie	Gainey	Garon
Lake	Lantsman	Gasparro	Gaudreau
Lawrence	Lawton	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lefebvre	Leslie	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gould
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Grant	Greaves
Lloyd	Lobb	Guay	Guilbeault
Mahal	Majumdar	Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle	Hanley	Harrison
Martel	Mazier	Hepfner	Hirtle
McCauley	McKenzie	Hodgson	Hogan
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo	Housefather	Hussen
Menegakis	Moore	Iacono	Idlout
Morin	Morrison	Jaczek	Jeneroux
Motz	Muys	Johns	Joly
Nater	Patzer	Joseph	Kayabaga
Paul-Hus	Poilievre	Kelloway	Khalid
Redekopp	Reid	Klassen	Koutrakis
Rempel Garner	Reynolds	Kwan	Lalonde
Richards	Roberts	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Rood	Ross	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Rowe	Ruff	Larouche	Lattanzio
Scheer	Schmale	Lauzon	Lavack
Seeback	Shipley	Lavoie	LeBlanc
Small	Steinley	Leitão	Lemire
Stevenson	Strahl	Lightbound	Long
Strauss	Stubbs	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma
Thomas	Tochor	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Tolmie	Van Popta	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Vien	Viersen	Maloney	May
Vis	Wagantall	McGuinty	McKelvie
Warkentin	Waugh	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
Williamson	Zimmer — 134	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson

NAYS

Members

Acan	Al Soud	Ménard	Mendès
Ali	Alty	Michel	Miedema
Anand	Anandasangaree	Miller	Mingarelli
Bains	Baker	Morrissey	Myles
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval	Naqvi	Nathan
Battiste	Beaulieu	Nguyen	Noormohamed
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Normandin	Ntumba
Bendayan	Bittle	Oliphant	Olshzewski
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	O'Rourke	Osborne
Blois	Bonin	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Boulerice	Brière	Plamondon	Powlowski
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carney	Provost	Ramsay
Carr	Casey	Rana	Robertson
Chagger	Champagne	Rocheport	Romanado
Champoux	Chang	Royer	Sahota
Chartrand	Chatel	Saini	Sarai
Chen	Chenette	Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Chi	Church	Sawatzky	Schiefke
Clark	Connors	Sgro	Sheehan
Cormier	Coteau	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Dabrusin	Dandurand	Simard	Sodhi
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Solomon	Sousa
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont	Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault	Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Desrochers	Dhaliwal	Thériault	Thompson
Dhillon	Diab	Turnbull	Valdez
Duclos	Duguid	van Koevreden	Vandenbeld
Dzerowicz	Earle	Villeneuve	Watchorn
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Weiler	Wilkinson
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Yip	Zahid
Fancy	Fanjoy	Zerucelli	Zuberi — 198
Fergus	Fisher		
Fonseca	Fortier		
Fortin	Fragiskatos		
Fraser	Fry		

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CLEAN COASTS ACT

The House resumed from February 13 consideration of the motion that Bill C-244, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-244, under Private Members' Business.

• (1545)

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 73)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)
Bendayan	Bittle
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Fuhr	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gasparro	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Gunn
Hajdu	Hanley
Harrison	Hepfner

Hirtle	Hodgson
Hogan	Housefather
Hussen	Iacono
Idlout	Jaczek
Jeneroux	Johns
Joly	Joseph
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Kibble
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kronis	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lavack	Lavoie
LeBlanc	Leitão
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
Mantle	May
McGuinty	McKelvie
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson
Ménard	Mendès
Michel	Miedema
Miller	Mingarelli
Morrissey	Myles
Naqvi	Nathan
Nguyen	Noormohamed
Normandin	Ntumba
Oliphant	Olzewski
O'Rourke	Osborne
Perron	Petipas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Provost	Ramsay
Rana	Robertson
Rochefort	Romanado
Royer	Sahota
Saini	Sari
Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Sawatzky	Schieffe
Sgro	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sodhi
Solomon	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thériault	Thompson
Tumbull	Valdez
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Villeneuve	Watchorn
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zerucelli	Zuberi— 202

Private Members' Business

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bexte
Block
Borrelli
Brassard
Calkins
Chambers
Cooper

Private Members' Business

Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Kelly	Khanna
Kirkland	Kmiec
Konanz	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kuruc
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lawton	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morin
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Schmale
Seeback	Shipley
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Williamson
Zimmer— 125	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

(Bill read a second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

[English]

FISHERIES ACT

The House resumed from February 23 consideration of the motion that Bill C-237, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act (Atlantic groundfish fisheries), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-237, under Private Members' Business.

The question is as follows. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (1555)

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 74)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Block	Bonk
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Chambers
Cobena	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
May	Mazier
McCauley	McKenzie
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds

Private Members' Business

Richards
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seeback
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 134

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech

Bendayan
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chagger
Champoux
Chartrand
Chen
Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
DeBellefeuille
Deschênes
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fuhr
Gaine
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Johns
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Brière
Carney
Casey
Champagne
Chang
Chatel
Chenette
Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould

Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Jeneroux
Joly
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde

Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 197

Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Perron
Plamondon
Provost
Rana
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[*Translation*]

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 41 minutes.

The member for Berthier—Maskinongé is rising on a point of order.

● (1600)

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you recognizing me. I simply want to inform you that, during the first vote, online voting began before you had finished reading the question to the House. This is not about calling anything into question, but perhaps some vigilance is needed here. This is the first time we have seen this.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

Jeff Kibble: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request unanimous consent with respect to the second vote. I used the app, but it did not work. It registered on the app that I had voted, but when I followed up afterward, it indicated I had not. Therefore, I am requesting unanimous consent to vote yea in support of Bill C-244 for the second vote.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, entitled “Compensation Disparities Between Unionized and Non-Unionized Workers in Canada”.

The text of the document has been submitted electronically to the table officers.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to adopt the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House:

(a) Government Orders be extended by six hours today; and

(b) in relation to proceedings at report stage of Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, later this day, all recorded divisions shall not be deferred, except pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8).

[English]

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

Agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

• (1605)

PETITIONS

ARMS EXPORTS

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table an e-petition signed by more than 3,300 Canadians who have joined the call to support Bill C-233.

The petitioners say that whereas Canada acceded to the Arms Trade Treaty in 2019, committing to prevent the transfer of arms where there is a substantial risk they could be used in human rights abuses, war crimes or crimes against humanity, a significant loophole in Canada's export laws currently allows Canadian-made weapons, parts and components to be exported to the United States, from where they may be transferred to third countries engaged in armed conflict or with records of grave human rights violations.

Petitioners further note that this loophole undermines Canada's international commitments, risking making Canada complicit in human rights abuses abroad, and allows Canadian arms to be used in conflicts against civilians. They also note that international bodies, including the UN Human Rights Council and independent UN experts, have called on all states to hold arms transfers where there is a substantial risk of their use in violations of international humanitarian law.

The petitioners therefore are calling on the House of Commons to enact legislation to close the existing loopholes in Canada's arms export laws, including removing exemptions for the United States, strengthening oversight and ensuring that Canadian arms are never used to commit or facilitate human rights abuses.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and I think this has been raised before, members have to be careful that they are not actually reading the petition. It is supposed to be short and concise, stating the principle of the petition and then sitting down.

The Speaker: I keep a close eye on that, but it did not strike me as a problem in this case.

The hon. member for Abbotsford—South Langley.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the good people of Abbotsford—South Langley, who have put forward this petition about the troubling proposal of the Liberal and Bloc amendments to Bill C-9 that would put the religious freedoms of Canadians at risk.

Petitioners are deeply troubled that the amendment would remove the good faith religious defence from the Criminal Code of Canada, which would lead to the criminalization of passages from the Bible, from the Quran, from the Guru Granth Sahib, from the Torah and from other sacred texts and expose individuals to prosecution when expressing sincerely held religious beliefs that the government may deem offensive.

According to this, the Government of Canada is being called on to withdraw Bill C-9, to protect religious freedoms and to defend the right to read and share sacred texts free from the government's interference.

RECREATIONAL SALMON FISHERY

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition as well. I am honoured to rise on behalf of the good people of Abbotsford—South Langley, who are deeply troubled with the proposed revisions to the salmon allocation policy, changes that would severely limit recreational fishery opportunities for the coho and chinook salmon of British Columbia.

Petitioners further emphasize that such changes would have serious consequences for the tourism sector and for the millions of dollars that recreational fisheries contribute to and conserve in the area.

B.C. SALMON FISHING INDUSTRY

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of British Columbian fishers and anglers, calling on the Minister of Fisheries to implement 100% clipping and coded wire tagging programs for hatchery chinook and coho salmon.

Coastal communities in B.C. are being hit hard by salmon retention closures, even as tens of millions of hatchery chinook are released each year. The problem is straightforward. Too few hatchery fish are being marked and tagged, making it difficult for managers to implement marked selective fisheries where hatchery fish can be retained and wild fish released. B.C.'s low marking rate remains a key barrier to retention opportunities.

This would protect wild fish stocks while allowing selective retention hatchery fish, supporting coastal communities, a way of life, over 9,000 jobs and a \$1.2-billion industry. I am pleased to present the petition and I urge the minister to act with urgency.

CLIMATE ACTION

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of many constituents, I rise to present a petition expressing their deep concern that Canada is off track to meet its targets under the Paris Agreement. These are not political targets but are based in the science, which demands that for the security of humankind, all life on the planet, our children and our grandchildren, we hold the global average temperature increase to no more than 2°C.

I will not read the petition, but many steps need to be taken that constitute bold climate action. The petitioners ask for the government to act swiftly.

• (1610)

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of individuals who also support the member for Cloverdale—Langley City's bill, Bill C-218, an act to amend the Criminal Code with respect to medical assistance in dying.

They understand that the Government of Canada intends to expand medical assistance in dying, or MAID, to individuals whose only medical condition is mental illness. Mental illness, they say, is treatable; recovery is possible, and experts agree that it is currently

Routine Proceedings

impossible to predict when a mental illness is truly irremediable. They are calling on the government on behalf of families and communities who are concerned that people who could recover through treatment and support may instead lose their lives.

Bill C-218, the right to recover act, would amend the Criminal Code to ensure that mental illness alone is not considered a grievous and irremediable condition for the purpose of MAID. Therefore, they, the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada, call upon the Government of Canada to pass Bill C-218 to stop the expansion of MAID to those whose sole underlying medical condition is a mental illness.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to continue to stand in the House, as are many on this side of the floor, in support of residents and citizens of Canada who are very concerned about the amendment put forward by the Liberal and Bloc parties to amend Bill C-9, which could be used to criminalize passages from the Bible, the Quran, the Torah and other sacred texts.

The state, they say, has no place in the religious texts or teachings of any faith community. Freedom of expression and freedom of religion are fundamental rights, and we need to preserve them.

Therefore, they, the individuals, the undersigned, call on the Liberal Government of Canada to protect religious freedom, uphold the right to read and share sacred texts, and prevent government overreach into matters of faith.

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to table a petition on behalf of residents from Port Alberni, Parksville, Qualicum and Courtenay in my riding who are concerned about rising inequality, austerity and the erosion of public services. These petitioners note that while corporate profits continue to reach record highs, more Canadians are struggling to afford the basics of life. They warn that austerity measures, particularly the government's planned \$25-billion reduction to publicly funded jobs and services, would only deepen inequality and undermine the programs that Canadians, especially seniors and people living with disabilities, rely on and are entitled to.

This petition also highlights that climate change is already costing Canadians billions of dollars each year and that a fair tax on extreme wealth would generate significant revenue to fund good-paying jobs, public services and a just transition to a sustainable economy.

Government Orders

Last, these petitioners are calling on the House to reconsider sweeping cuts to jobs and services and to bring forward legislation that would ensure that corporations and the wealthiest of Canadians pay their fair share.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Riding Mountain, Mental Health and Addictions; the hon. member for Leduc—Wetaskiwin, Finance; the hon. member for York—Durham, Ethics.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS
BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

[English]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): There are 82 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-15.

Motions Nos. 1 through 82 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

[Translation]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 to 82 to the House.

[English]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 126.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 127.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 128.

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 129.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 130.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 131.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 132.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 133.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 134.

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 135.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 136.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 137.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 138.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 139.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 140.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 141.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 142.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 143.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 144.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 145.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 146.

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 147.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 148.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 149.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 150.

Government Orders

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 151.

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 152.

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 153.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 154.

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 155.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 156.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 157.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 158.

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 167.

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 168.

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 169.

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 170.

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 171.

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 172.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 173.

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 174.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 175.

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 176.

● (1615)

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 191.

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 192.

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 193.

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 194.

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 203.

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 204.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 205.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 206.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 207.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 208.

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 209.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 224.

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 225.

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 226.

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 227.

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 228.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 229.

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 230.

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 231.

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 232.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 233.

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 234.

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 235.

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 236.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 237.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 238.

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 239.

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 240.

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 241.

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 242.

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 243.

Motion No. 75

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 244.

Motion No. 76

Government Orders

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 245.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 246.

● (1620)

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 373.

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 374.

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 375.

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 597.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-15 be amended by deleting Clause 598.

[*English*]

He said: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are facing multiple overlapping crises, from difficulties finding affordable housing and buying groceries to feed their families, to a climate emergency that threatens our very planet. The budget was an opportunity to meet this moment. Unfortunately, in New Democrats' view, it has failed. In fact, it would actually reverse many measures the Liberals themselves told Canadians were essential just months ago.

New Democrats believe much more can and should be done to build a stronger, more prosperous and independent Canada that works for all Canadians. Accordingly, we proposed a number of amendments and changes to the budget to meet this objective. Today I will highlight those at report stage that relate to sections of the budget that we argue should be deleted.

First, the Liberals' decision to repeal the digital services tax would hand a major victory to U.S. tech giants at the direct expense of Canadian taxpayers and an even greater victory to Donald Trump. When the Liberals announced this measure in budget 2021, they described it as essential "to ensure that corporations in all sectors, including digital corporations, pay their fair share of tax on that money they earn by doing business in Canada." Those are not my words. They are the words of the Liberal government. When the Trump administration objected, the Liberals pledged to abandon this measure immediately.

The digital services tax was specifically designed to ensure that the largest U.S. tech giants, companies like those led by Elon Musk and Mark Zuckerberg, contribute fairly to the Canadian economy with the profits they make here from Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer estimated it would raise \$7.2 billion over five years, revenue that could have supported public services, infrastructure and programs Canadians need and rely on. Instead, the Liberals caved to Donald Trump, walked away from billions in revenue and gave up a tool meant to level the playing field for Canadian businesses, all without negotiating a single benefit for Canada in return.

The result is that the Liberals are rewarding the biggest foreign tech corporations while eliminating tens of thousands of family-sustaining jobs and slashing services that Canadians rely on. New Democrats say that is the wrong way to go.

Second, the budget would repeal the underused housing tax during a housing crisis, which is a truly baffling decision. When this measure was first introduced, the Liberals described it as "a national, tax-based measure targeting the unproductive use of domestic housing that is owned by non-resident, non-Canadians", arguing that it would ensure foreign owners who use Canada as a place to passively store wealth in housing "pay their fair share". Again, it was the Liberals who said that, yet in this budget, the Liberals today wish to eliminate this measure entirely. I guess the development industry has gotten to them.

The PBO estimates the underused housing tax would raise \$693 million over five years. Repealing it means we would be walking away from hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue that could be used to support truly affordable non-market housing, municipal infrastructure or other public priorities. It would also remove an important policy lever designed to discourage vacant foreign-investor-held properties at a time when Canadians are struggling with some of the worst housing affordability challenges in our country's history. This would encourage premises to stay vacant when renters are desperately in need of spaces to call home.

Third, while working-class Canadians are told by the government to make sacrifices, the government is proposing to repeal the luxury tax on private jets and yachts. The contrast could not be more glaring: austerity for working people, and tax breaks for those at the very top. It is also another total liberal backflip. In budget 2021, the Liberals argued that "Those who can afford to buy luxury goods can afford to pay a bit more", especially at a time when ordinary Canadians were making sacrifices to keep our economy afloat post-COVID.

● (1625)

To New Democrats, that logic still holds, yet the Liberals are now abandoning the luxury tax on private jets and yachts entirely. Their justification is that the luxury tax costs more to administer than it brings in, but their own 2025 budget contradicts this claim. Eliminating the tax would cost \$135 million over five years in lost revenue. Walking away from this revenue is a political choice, one that benefits the wealthiest in Canada, while the Liberal government eliminates tens of thousands of family-sustaining jobs and slashes services Canadians rely on because it claims to have a revenue problem.

Government Orders

What makes this decision even more troubling is that unions in the aviation and boating sectors have proposed practical solutions to address the potential industry impacts of this measure, not a full repeal of the luxury tax. Instead of listening to workers and refining the policy, though, the Liberals are listening to the ultrawealthy in this country and seeking to scrap it altogether. The result is a policy retreat that gives up hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue, abandons an important tax fairness measure aimed at the ultrawealthy and ignores the constructive proposals put forward by workers and their unions who were ready to help improve the system rather than dismantle it.

Fourth, Bill C-15 contains a serious threat to Canada's democratic foundations. Division 5 of part 5 contains clauses that would grant federal ministers sweeping Henry VIII-style powers to temporarily exempt any individual corporation, individual, partnership, association or organization from the application of almost every federal law and regulation. Although the Liberals made a deal to accept Conservative amendments at committee to add some limited guardrails to these provisions, the core issue remains. This legislation would give ministers the extraordinary power to exempt specific people and corporations from federal laws and regulations. These exemptions could override labour standards, health and safety rules, environmental protections, indigenous rights and more. Even with the limited guardrails, the scope of potential exemptions remains incredibly expansive.

This undermines the separation of powers by allowing the executive to override laws passed by this Parliament without full transparency or accountability. These clauses do not streamline regulation, as has been claimed. Rather, they erode the rule of law and create a two-tier system where laws passed by Parliament can be suspended arbitrarily. Legal experts and civil liberties advocates maintain that this is not true regulatory sandboxing, as is claimed. They argue that even with the deal cut with the Conservatives, this approach is too broad and is less transparent than existing sandbox frameworks in other jurisdictions.

The NDP maintains that these clauses cannot be fixed through backroom deals between the Liberals and Conservatives. Indeed, the government still has not publicly justified why such extraordinary powers are necessary. Measures of this magnitude should not be buried in a 600-page omnibus budget bill, which Liberals themselves, in opposition, said they would not bring in. Once in government, it is a different story. If the Liberals believe these powers are essential, they should introduce stand-alone legislation that can be fully studied and debated transparently. To protect democratic governance, the rule of law and Canada's constitutional order, division 5 of part 5 should be removed from Bill C-15 entirely.

Fifth, clauses 373 to 375 of Bill C-15 would retroactively redefine "province" to exclude the territories in the veterans health care regulations as it relates to accommodation and meals payment by veterans in long-term care. In short, this would allow Veterans Affairs Canada to legitimize its past overcharges to veterans and nullify ongoing litigation aimed at securing reimbursement for affected veterans. Canada's Veterans Ombud, retired Colonel Nishika Jardine, has written to the Minister of Veteran Affairs asking that these provisions be removed from the bill. In her words, "using retroactive legislation to correct administrative errors is both inappropriate

and unfair and undermines confidence in government decision-making".

She continues:

Ultimately, it is clear to the Veteran community that Bill C-15 [changes] are meant solely to correct an error made by the Department and to deny [veterans] compensation for the overcharge. VAC already faces growing reputational backlash over the manner in which it communicates with Canada's Veterans, their families and Survivors. I fear this retroactivity measure, if enacted, will only increase the deep distrust....

• (1630)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is significant for us to recognize that this particular budget reflects the last federal election. It reflects what the Prime Minister and members of the Liberal caucus have brought forward on behalf of our constituents.

This includes making the school food program permanent, ensuring the longevity of the dental care program and ensuring that we have the largest investment in expanding housing opportunities from coast to coast to coast. There are a lot of wonderful things in the budget. They are all meant to build Canada strong.

I would encourage all members of the House to see the value in the bigger picture on how this budget would make Canada a stronger and healthier nation.

Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I am glad my hon. colleague brought up the last election. I do not recall the Liberals telling Canadians in the last election that if they were elected, they would cave to Donald Trump and remove the digital services tax. Frankly, the Liberals told Canadians they would have an elbows-up approach and take a firm stance with Donald Trump.

I do not recall the Liberals telling Canadians that they would get rid of the underused housing tax, which is a measure that is starting to work in this country; house prices are starting to come down. I do not recall the Liberals telling Canadians that they were going to hurt veterans by overcharging them for long-term care. They did not say those things.

There is a fundamental question of credibility raised by my hon. colleague. When parties tell Canadians something during an election, Canadians expect them to be true to it when they are in government. The Liberals are failing that test.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and friend for his excellent speech and congratulate him on it.

Government Orders

I would like to continue with the issue of taxing web giants. This is a matter of basic fairness. These multinationals use tax havens to avoid paying a single penny of taxes in Canada. The government had put in place a tax to offset that, but over the summer, the current Prime Minister said that he was going to put an end to all of this on the pretext that, as of July 21, Canada was going to have a new trade agreement with the United States to resolve tensions. That was on July 21, and the tax was not implemented. I was stunned to see this tax repealed in the budget and in Bill C-15. In my opinion, there is no reason for that.

My question is this: What message does this send to our international allies in countries that have implemented these taxes when they see Canada breaking ranks in this way and throwing itself into the arms of the American President?

[English]

Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for that excellent question. Much is raised by that question, including the proper approach to dealing with what we all agree is a difficult Donald Trump administration. Nevertheless, the Liberal government said it would stand up to the Trump administration, yet all we have seen is concession after concession, and we are getting nothing in return.

It raises the fundamental question of tax fairness. If we are not going to tax the largest, most profitable digital corporations in the world, U.S. tech giants that make hundreds of billions of dollars every year, then what message does that send to ordinary Canadians who the Prime Minister asked to tighten their belts? What message does it send to the 50,000 federal civil servants who are getting pink slips, and the tens of thousands more of their family members, because the government says it does not have enough money?

It sends the message that the government cares more about pleasing Donald Trump and pleasing U.S. tech giants than it does about fundamental fairness to Canadians in this country, and New Democrats—

• (1635)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Questions and comments, the hon. member for York—Durham.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned tax fairness in his most recent response. I am increasingly concerned with the tax unfairness being brought on by the Liberal budget. Canadians in the next generation will have to pay for every dollar that is borrowed.

Does the member think it is fair for the next generation to be saddled with the debts of this generation for their entire lives?

Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not. The government has a revenue problem. Instead of cutting and slashing services that Canadians need at a time when we are facing crises, and I must respectfully say the Conservatives would slash even more, what we need to do is raise revenue in a fair and progressive manner.

That is why we should do things like tax yachts, private jets and U.S. tech giants, and make sure that the wealthiest pay a bit more. That is what the Liberals said was necessary before the last election, and it is something New Democrats believe in. We have a great country. We need to pay for the services Canadians—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Mirabel.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues who are here today.

Today, we are debating Bill C-15, the budget implementation bill, which we are now considering at report stage. Believe it or not, some people are tuning in at home. I know a few of them. These people need to understand what the report stage is.

The 603-page budget contains a great many things that will be toxic for Quebec, toxic for some of our industries, toxic for co-ops like Desjardins, and toxic for farmers. When a budget is this toxic, amendments are put forward at committee. The committee met on Monday. Sometimes, people think that the work is over after the committee stage, but the reality is that we still get one last chance to make this inadequate budget a little less bad or a little better. The last chance that we get, the final opportunity, is now, the report stage. The report sets out the amendments, but we can still change them.

What happened at the committee meeting that took place on Monday under a closure motion is inexplicable. Some parts of the bill should have been changed by consensus. Lessons were offered and explanations were given, but no one was willing to listen. I will give the example of the high-speed rail network act.

The part of the budget containing the high-speed rail network act gives powers to an operator that is basically doing the government's dirty work, but without being subject to scrutiny by the Auditor General or the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The operator is being given excessive expropriation powers. It will be allowed to violate the rights of people whose property will be expropriated for the rail project, including rights that all other Canadians continue to have. This will create second-class citizens along the rail corridor.

The government says the same thing was done in Quebec for the Réseau express métropolitain, or REM. However, Quebec's REM network is only a few dozen kilometres long. Its tracks curve, it can use existing rights-of-way, it does not go by as many homes and it has stops everywhere and creates benefits along almost every kilometre of track. However, the federal government is taking that remedy and applying it to the wrong problem. It is applying it to a network that is completely different. This network is 1,000 kilometres long. It cannot use existing rights-of-way in many cases, it does not curve and it hardly stops anywhere, yet the government says that the same remedy is being applied.

Government Orders

People are being stripped of their right to challenge expropriations before a hearing officer. Hearings are an alternative mechanism that help avoid mass challenges before the Federal Court. This means we could end up with 1,000 kilometres' worth of property owners going to the Federal Court, at a time when the government is struggling to appoint judges.

What were our amendments? They sought to allow people who receive an expropriation notice to request a hearing before a hearing officer within 30 days, as is the law for all Canadians. The Conservatives abstained from voting on this amendment and allowed the Liberals to create two classes of citizens, particularly in my riding, in Mirabel. My constituents went through expropriations once before. Abstaining is not an option when it comes to equality before the law. Abstaining is not an option. This time, we want members to vote in the House.

We also wanted people who receive an expropriation notice to be allowed to rebuild a cattle shed, a barn or other agricultural facilities following a disaster. Here is what the current bill would do. If the path of the high-speed train crosses so much as a corner of a person's farm and their cattle shed burns down, they are not allowed to rebuild it.

My friend Éric Couvrette is tuning in today. The summer before last, Éric's cattle shed burned down to the ground. He lost all his cattle and his entire livelihood to the fire. It is a tragedy that everyone in Mirabel knows about. He could no longer make a living. Under the current bill, if the high-speed train crosses the end of his property, even if it is nowhere near the cattle shed, he would not have the right to rebuild it. The people in my riding will understand what that means. People living in agricultural areas will understand the seriousness of what the government is doing. That is why we wanted to fix that.

• (1640)

What did the government tell us? It said that it was going to compromise and allow people to rebuild in the event of a natural disaster, but even that was too much. The Liberals withdrew their own amendment and, in the end, they said that, if there was a fire, tornado or flood, the poor souls could not rebuild and would have to declare bankruptcy. That is the Liberals' approach to equality before the law. We wanted to fix that. The amendment that we are tabling today gives the Conservatives and the Liberals one last chance to show a little compassion, respect and concern for equality among citizens.

We also wanted to give people back the 30-day period for appealing to a hearing officer. Alto is lying to people. Alto says that it is not true that people will no longer have 30 days to appeal the decision to a hearing officer if their land is expropriated. However, if there is no hearing officer anymore, then what is the point of the 30-day period? We want to give people back those rights. More importantly, we want to ensure that, if a person's land is expropriated, it cannot be done by email by default. What we are saying is that, if people want to communicate with Alto by email, they should be free to do so, but it must be at their request. It should not be up to Alto to be so magnanimous that it decides to send people registered letters the day their land is being expropriated. To me, that does not seem like too much to ask.

We also want the digital services tax to be reinstated. Do my colleagues know what that is? The NDP member was very diplomatic. The elimination of the digital services tax was just a way of sucking up to Donald Trump. The Prime Minister woke up one morning and decided to kowtow to the President in the hope that this would serve him well, but in the end, it did not. He lost out on \$1 billion in revenue a year. Meanwhile, the privately owned media sector is in crisis because its content is being stolen by the big platforms, yet the minimum tax on multinationals has been scrapped and they are getting a free pass in Canada as if it were no big deal. There is nothing for our media at a time when the media is in crisis. We want that to be fixed. We want that tax to be reinstated.

We want the deficiencies in the open banking system, or consumer-driven banking, to be fixed. In the bill, the government wanted to regulate not only banks, which are federally regulated, but also digital brokers, which are considered retailers and fall under the legislative purview of Quebec and the provinces. This means that the federal government wants to tell Desjardins Group what to do. It wants to tell institutions that fall under Quebec's jurisdiction what to do. Obviously, it is not just Quebec. Albertans would also be affected. Alberta has ATB Financial, or Alberta Treasury Branches, formerly known as Alberta's Public Bank. However, it is not really a bank, so much so that the federal government went after it, demanding that it change its name. The federal government was trying to regulate a branch of the Alberta government. Some amendments did get adopted, but one has yet to be adopted. That is the amendment that says that if there is a dispute over jurisdiction and the federal government wants to regulate these brokers, there will be another problem, namely the minister's obligation to meet with their provincial counterparts to ensure the matter does not end up at the Supreme Court and the banking system can truly be open. Well, guess what? The Liberals voted against that. That is what I mean when I say that this is toxic for the provinces. In this case, modernity is not exclusive to the federal government. Brokers do not manufacture financial products and are not federally regulated.

Let us talk about the red tape reduction act. Regulatory sandboxes are fine, but there are models of them around the world. These models do not all give any minister, in any sector, the right to suspend just about anything, giving the executive branch lots of latitude to determine the road map for verifying that process. This is a violation of Parliament's prerogative. There was a compromise. The Liberals struck a deal with the Conservatives. However, as has been said before, this does not protect the environment, first nations or workers. We want to fix that. That part of the bill needs to be thrown out and redone, as we do with anything that deserves to be thrown out.

As members can see, we are being constructive. We want to make this budget less toxic. We are proposing constructive changes, and we are reintroducing these amendments because we believe that even people with a negative attitude, as we are currently seeing across the way, can change their minds and start thinking positive.

Government Orders

• (1645)

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear the Bloc Québécois member using fear tactics. These are the same tactics used by the Conservative Party. What surprises me even more is the absolutely inappropriate language he used and the context in which he used it.

I am not sure whether the member feels that, because there are not many members who speak French in the House right now, he can say things that are clearly inappropriate. Still, I invite him to apologize and withdraw some of his remarks.

He is still talking about expropriation. That legislation was passed. We talked about that. He knows full well that the laws governing the high-speed train and the laws on expropriation have changed significantly and are no longer the same as they were in 1969, so this is frankly unbelievable.

As a Quebecker, I have always been very proud of my province's forward-thinking policies. I am curious as to why the member does not support the policies we are putting forward, like the Canadian dental care plan and the national school food program, for which—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I must give the hon. member time to respond.

The hon. member for Mirabel.

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, it is hard not to respond politely to someone who is so pleasant and constructive and who contributes so positively to parliamentary debate. I commend my colleague for her constructive tone. She is being very pleasant today. I want to commend her. This is good.

The Prime Minister decided to suck up to the U.S. President. What else can I say? That is what he did. He kowtowed. What—

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member keeps using language that has absolutely no place in this Parliament. This language, in effect, denigrates the Prime Minister of Canada.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I thank the member for her comments, and I am going to ask all hon. members to be careful about the language they use in the House. We should all be more careful in terms of what we say in the House.

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his excellent speech.

I want to come back to a point he raised about the open banking system, consumer protection, data portability and things like that.

To his knowledge, has the Government of Quebec been consulted and is it on board with the content of Bill C-15? To his knowledge, has there been communication between the Government of Quebec and the federal government? What was the federal government's response to a collaboration on an issue that, honestly, should not be controversial?

• (1650)

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, they want an open banking system. My understanding is that this was done unilaterally and that

the amendments we tabled were intended to ensure that Quebec's constitutional prerogatives are respected.

A broker selling banking products is not a bank. As proof that we are being constructive, that we have a good attitude and that our language is very positive, albeit flowery, the Liberals were forced to vote in favour of several of our amendments on this issue. Otherwise, Bill C-15 would have landed at the Supreme Court time and time again.

There is still a ways to go. When more problems arise, there should be an automatic mechanism in place so that the federal government do not end up at the Supreme Court fighting jurisdictional battles, and that is exactly what we find in the amendments.

[*English*]

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my hon. friend, who is on the finance committee with me, wanted to comment on some of the other pieces of the bill that had to be amended at the finance committee. We have seen over and over again the government's penchant for consolidating power into the executive and removing the powers of parliamentarians. We had to amend this bill at committee to give more accountability to the extraordinary powers that the government tried to grant itself.

Would he like to comment on that or any of the other examples we have had of the government's penchant for the consolidation of power with the executive?

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon: Mr. Speaker, I hold my colleague in high regard. He knows that.

However, despite the fact that I like him very much, he is still a colleague who voted in favour of Bill C-5 and concentrated power in the hands of the government. He is still a colleague who—unless he changes his mind, and I invite him to do so—voted in favour of expropriation to further strengthen the government's powers. In this case, it is actually for a branch of government that is not subject to parliamentary scrutiny. He is a colleague who decided to make a deal with the government over the infamous red tape reduction act, which allows the government to violate a number of laws within regulatory sandboxes. Again, this could be a good model. There are models outside Canada, but this is not what they look like.

We are talking about a 603-page bill here. In any bad 603-page novel, there are a few good chapters. Clearly, we could talk about this for hours.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak to this important bill. I will pick up on some of what my colleague from Mirabel said.

Government Orders

I would like to be asked other kinds of questions rather than being told that I am fearmongering. The Bloc Québécois's job is to read the bills that are introduced. As a constructive and intelligent opposition party, we need to look at the issues in the bills and propose amendments in order to stand up for our constituents.

In terms of Bill C-15, it was quite a challenge, because it is quite the tome. There are a number of things that do not suit us here. First, I would like to directly discuss all the exemptions being given to the Alto high-speed train project. I am told that it is a good project and that, in Canada, projects generally do not go ahead fast enough. I am told that things need to move very quickly. However, in an omnibus bill like this one, all kinds of rights are being taken away from my constituents in Berthier—Maskinongé. I would remind the House that this project, if it ever sees the light of day, will go through my riding.

I think the work that we do is important. Raising the red flag, as we did on our opposition day to get an apology and a commitment regarding the expropriations that occurred in Mirabel, is not fearmongering. The goal was to get an apology for the people of Mirabel, but also a commitment to ensure that such atrocities never happen again. Everyone agreed on that day, and everyone voted in favour of our motion. We are very pleased about that. However, there are still some things in Bill C-15 that do not make sense.

Why should someone who is being expropriated not have the right to be heard by a commissioner? I was told again earlier that we should stop scaring people because the laws have changed since 1970. We agree, but the problem is that in Bill C-15, the government is amending the laws that have been changed since 1970. The government seems to want to return to the discretionary power of 1970.

Two consultations were held in recent weeks very near Berthier—Maskinongé, one in Trois-Rivières one in Berthierville. I spent a lot of time chatting with people from Alto, but also with people who came looking for facts, to get information and to voice their concerns. I was told not to worry, that everything would be done by mutual consent and that there would be no expropriation by email. I was told that what I was saying is not true. However, when a thing is written in law, even though I am prepared to listen to what a person has to say, what they say has to be truthful. When I am told not to worry, that expropriation laws have improved since 1970, as I just said, I can accept it all up to that point, but then why is the government changing the laws in Bill C-15?

As I asked the Alto officials, if their project is so good, why do laws need to be changed in order to approve it? Is it because everything has to be done fast, or is it to prevent people from seeking remedies and calling things into question? I think we run the risk of making some serious mistakes.

There is a lot of talk these days about wasteful spending, whether in Quebec City or Ottawa. We gave a full list of examples during question period today. There is a lot of talk about the Cúram fiasco at the moment. We need only look at the SAAQclic fiasco in Quebec and the outcomes of the commission of inquiry. What were we told? What happened? How is it that things were allowed to go on for that long? Why were there so many mistakes? We learned that the people responsible for the project suddenly said that it absolute-

ly had to be done and that it had to be done quickly. "Let's go, no big deal. We need to plow ahead and move forward." The government did not take the time that was needed and did not conduct any assessments, and that is why it was expensive.

Do I want this to be the case for my constituents in Berthier—Maskinongé? What are we here to do as members in the House of Commons? As opposition members in the House, we are not the government's yes-men and our job is not to make the government happy. We are here to protect our constituents' interests. That is what we are doing when we raise these issues. I would like to survey the elected members of the House of Commons right now. How many of the 343 members feel that the Canadian Transportation Agency serves no purpose, that it just slows projects down, that it is a hindrance and that we should get rid of that useless agency? The fact remains that it is a recognized institution made up of transportation experts.

• (1655)

When we become members of Parliament, we do not suddenly become experts in everything just because we are elected officials. Unfortunately, many people here believe that they are experts simply because of the status we have here, but that is not the case. The truth is that we are people from all walks of life and of all ages. Our job is to seek expert advice, to inform ourselves as best we can on each issue and to make informed decisions in the public interest to protect our constituents. It is not our job to help a company move faster.

We all agree on one point, and that is that, once a high-speed train has been built, it must be fast. Yes, it has to go fast. However, do the project development and construction also have to go that fast? We should refrain from moving that quickly if it means respecting even one citizen, avoiding dividing even one piece of farmland in two and preserving Quebec's best farmland.

Incidentally, we are not talking about something absurd here. Some 2% of Quebec's territory is farmland. Every time a project comes up, it affects farmland. That could happen again. Farmland will inevitably be affected if the train goes through.

We are not being negative. We are simply asking the following question: Why are citizens being deprived of their right to appeal? I have not received an answer to this question. I am going to be told once again that we are fearmongering. I am preparing for the next round of comments. Again, that is what I am going to be told. I am not fearmongering. I am standing up for my constituents, because that is my job. If I ever stop defending the people of Berthier—Maskinongé, I have no business being here. That is the reality. That is all I am here to do, as honestly as possible, with as much integrity as possible and, most of the time, as calmly as possible, although I do get carried away sometimes.

Government Orders

I cannot understand why the government decided to allow expropriation notices to be sent by email. What shocks me the most is that, when I say that, people say that what I am saying is not true. They said it here and at the Alto briefing. It was not much of a consultation and it seems to me that we can do better, but I talked to some nice people for a while. The first reaction was to say that what I was saying was not true, that I was telling lies. I replied that it was in the law, that it was not a lie and I suggested reading the law together. The person told me that people had to opt in for that to happen. That is Alto's preference, but it is not what the law says. That is one of the amendments we proposed.

How can the requirement to conduct an environmental impact assessment for a project be removed? I cannot think of a good justification for that. It is not that urgent. First, we are already behind schedule for a high-speed rail line in North America. Let us just accept that. It is not as though we want to be in step with everyone else. It will take five more years, but that is not a problem. I do not mind. It will take two more years. It will take three more years. It will take six more months. It all depends on what happens.

Still, I think that protecting the rights of Canadians is important. That is why we are making an effort this evening, even at report stage, to bring these amendments. I am appealing to members of the government and members of the Conservative Party who support the project. Usually, the best way to pass a project is through social licence. Otherwise, it will fail. Social licence is not gained by taking away people's civil rights. That does not work. It takes a different approach. Things are really off to a bad start.

That is what we are calling for this evening. We are issuing this call and it is important, because the land will remain in our control for a long time. There is usually a 120-day period when nothing can happen on land identified for expropriation. The government wants to extend that to two years. As mentioned during the last opposition day, not everyone in the 10-kilometre corridor is going to be expropriated, because all they need is 60 metres. That is one cause of the uncertainty that people are feeling, yet we are the ones accused of fearmongering. I do not think so.

There are other things that are unacceptable. I have spent a lot of time on this because it affects me deeply.

The digital services tax is simply ridiculous. We are happy to have restored the reduced rates for libraries, but we had to alert the minister to the issue. That is our job. I think he appreciated that we brought this to his attention. That is our job.

● (1700)

This is our message to the government: If they want this project to work, then they have to stop taking people's rights away and not change the laws.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague. I also really appreciate his tone, which is much more constructive than that of his colleague. I am extremely pleased to be working with him. He is also my riding neighbour, incidentally, so I understand very well how folks in his riding feel about the train.

High-speed rail is a once-in-a-generation project. It is a project that will enable us to generate significant economic benefits, including in his region. I know he knows that. Many people agree. They really want to see this project come to fruition. We must ensure that we have the resources we need to build our economy.

As I said earlier, as a Quebecker, I am so proud to come from a province that is truly at the forefront of social programs that have been implemented and replicated across Canada. How can my colleague, as a Quebecker, stand up and vote against Bill C-15, which provides care to the most vulnerable Canadians?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. She and I are riding neighbours. I was looking forward to that question. At long last, somebody asked it.

Of course, there are inevitably some welcome measures in any omnibus bill, but there are many others that are not. Our job in the opposition is to identify these elements. We take out a marker and jot down, for example, "why change the law for one specific high-speed train project?"

We are telling the government that it should not do that. If it wants the project to go ahead, it should not do that. People would trust it more. When I talk to the people at Alto and they tell me not to worry and that they will play nice, I want to believe them. However, why does the law say that they can get around people's rights?

That provision needs to be removed. My message is simple: It needs to go.

● (1705)

[*English*]

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is definitely a lack of confidence in the Liberal government. I wonder if the member could tell us again why he does not trust the government to follow through on its promises, in particular, the high-speed rail project.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, my lack of trust comes from being told to calm down and not worry, that expropriation laws have changed since the 1970s and that rights are protected. I believe those words and I accept them. My response to that is, okay, the laws have changed, so why are they being changed again to make way for the train?

The laws were improved, and for good reason. Legislation and case law are built up in a society through experience, both good and bad. Among other things, Mirabel was a traumatic event that created an opportunity to improve the laws. Now the laws are fair. People's rights are protected, so why are we going to take away those rights?

Government Orders

I cannot trust someone who tells me not to worry and that the government will treat people fairly, when the law is going to state that the government can force people to do something even if they say no and that they will have no right to challenge the decision. I cannot.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague a question about Bill C-15 and the message it sends for democracy.

Let me explain. My colleague, the member for Mirabel, spoke out about the tax on digital giants that was withdrawn to please the U.S. president. In the end, it achieved nothing except to exacerbate the media crisis, because there were no announcements to provide further assistance to local or community media and private media outlets that are losing advertising revenue. Yet there is clear evidence of a direct link between these media outlets, this diversity of voices in the regions, and democracy.

Regarding Bill C-15, I have been approached by many environmental groups who are concerned about the environmental impact of this bill and the fact that it repeals existing laws. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on this concern.

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, certainly when environmental rights are removed, we cannot help but be concerned. It is hard to feel confident.

When it comes to information, it is such a sensitive issue in regions like mine. Local media outlets need capital investment. We worked so hard to implement the digital services tax. It is incredibly sad to see it being scrapped to please our American neighbours. I understand that in negotiations, compromises have to be made and all that, but it has been a while since it was removed, and we are wondering when we will see results. We need to put other measures in place if we remove this one. We need to protect our media.

[*English*]

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss Bill C-15 at a critical time in Canada's history. When I knock on doors in my community in Newmarket—Aurora, Canadians are very clear about what they want. They want action. They want results. They know that the government has enough power to make big changes. They are watching and waiting in anticipation. They expect progress, but sadly they are still anxiously waiting to see it.

We have already passed Bill C-5, the major projects legislation. Canadians expect to see fundamental changes in how quickly projects are approved and built. They are watching to see whether the government can finally move at the speed required to compete globally.

They are also watching the broader economic picture. They have been told that deficits must rise in order to invest in growth. However, I warn the government that this is extremely risky given that persistent deficits can lead to inflation. They have been told that regulatory reform is necessary to unlock productivity. While I agree, this must never come with the huge price tag of less accountability and transparency.

Now, through Bill C-15, we are creating regulatory sandboxes intended to accelerate innovation, particularly in environmental

technology and financial technology. Taken together, these are significant levers of economic transformation, and we must remember the institutional reality in which these decisions are made.

Canada already has one of the most centralized executive systems in the democratic world. The Prime Minister's Office exercises immense influence over cabinet, its chief of staff, the political party of the government, Crown corporations, appointments to the Senate and the judiciary, the senior public service, major projects and regulatory sandboxes for innovation in financial technology and environmental technology. The government has the capacity to make radical and meaningful changes to address productivity, competitiveness and economic growth.

As Conservatives, we do not always agree with the approach being taken, but we stand loyal to Canadians by supporting legislation that is good for our country and opposing that which is bad. The message Canadians have sent clearly and strongly is that something needs to get done. They expect us to work together to move forward in the best possible way.

I believe Canadians can take real pride in what has happened with Bill C-15. Members of the opposition, civil liberties organizations, environmental groups, journalists and engaged Canadians across the country raised serious concerns about a provision that would have granted extraordinary authority to individual cabinet ministers, what I describe as the powers of a king. As originally drafted, the provision would have allowed individual cabinet ministers and the Prime Minister to exempt hand-picked individuals or entities from more than 150 years of Canadian federal law, quietly and behind closed doors. This was an immense concentration of power in the hands of individual cabinet ministers.

When this came to light, the government said the provision was introduced in good faith, an accidental power grab of immense proportions, but what is clear is that the provision was not drafted with the safeguards that Canadians expect so concerns were raised. Several cabinet ministers struggled to justify it. Heated debate followed. Public pressure escalated. Ultimately, meaningful changes were negotiated and secured by the Conservatives.

Canadians can look at this moment with pride. Political parties rose above their differences. A fundamental issue was recognized, and while I would have preferred to remove these provisions, concerns were addressed. As a result, I have received personal notes from supporters from all political parties saying that they appreciate the amendments.

Government Orders

• (1710)

This is also a powerful reminder of something essential in a parliamentary democracy: the importance of a strong opposition, an opposition that asks questions, examines power carefully and ensures democratic safeguards remain in place. While it is disappointing to hear my Liberal colleagues describe this negotiation as “obstruction”, this is how a true democratic system is to work.

I will now remind colleagues and Canadians what the core issue was and what has changed.

The amendments were on what I describe as the “powers of a king” provision. As originally written, the provision granted individual cabinet ministers the extraordinary power to exempt hand-picked individuals or entities from almost any federal law, with the sole exception of the Criminal Code. This is an immense concentration of power. The passed amendments seek to strike a balance between innovation and democratic safeguards. It would preserve the ability to create sandboxes that support innovation, particularly in the clean tech and financial technology sectors, while ensuring that such flexibility operates within clear democratic limits.

Specifically, the amendments introduced seven key protections. First is a new, mandatory, 30-day public consultation prior to an exemption being granted. Second is equal rules that apply to all participants within a sector, not only hand-picked companies. Third is dual approval by both a cabinet minister and the President of the Treasury Board. Fourth is mandatory publication of orders within 30 days. Fifth is a full report to Parliament within 90 days, explaining the rationale and assessing whether permanent legislative change is warranted so that we can continue to foster innovation. Sixth is a requirement that ministers appear before committee when requested to explain the sandbox. Seventh is clear limits on what can never be exempted, including foundational statutes such as the Access to Information Act, Auditor General Act, Canada Elections Act, Conflict of Interest Act, Financial Administration Act, Privacy Act, Investment Canada Act and other core accountability, safety and national interest laws.

While I would have preferred to remove this provision altogether and have it studied fully to carefully define the limits of any regulatory sandbox and the procedures governing it, I believe the amended language represents a balanced and responsible path forward. It meets the urgency of the moment while preserving the accountability, transparency and democratic standards Canadians expect.

Canadians expect us to move forward, and they expect us to work constructively at a moment when economic pressures and global competition demand focus and resolve. I look at this moment not as a moment of division, but as a moment of responsibility. I want to reassure Canadians that, every step of the way, Conservatives will continue on a disciplined path to hold the government accountable and negotiate changes that are good for Canadians.

I thank every single Canadian who signed my petition and who wrote articles, letters, emails and messages. Their advocacy has won today.

• (1715)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I appreciate the comments from the

member for Newmarket—Aurora. I genuinely appreciate the experience that she brings to the House. The member spoke about productivity, competitiveness and the need for economic growth, which we are very much aligned on, and also the need to work together and the importance of our Canadian democratic institutions.

My question to the member is on the global context of things that are going on in the world right now. Where does she see that continuous collaboration and constructive criticism fitting into Canada's place in the world?

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, I take particular pride in Bill C-15, particularly in the amendments we put forward. This is an example of how we can work together and of how working together will, in fact, make the bill stronger. This is critical as we fight for stronger take-home pay for Canadians, as we work together for a sovereign Canada and as we focus on several issues that are critical for Canadians today, including crime and affordability.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on her speech.

We often hear that the opposition is here to oppose and obstruct bills. On the contrary, we are here to provide constructive criticism, to improve and enhance the bills under consideration. Bill C-15 was studied at breakneck speed since it is a 600-page bill containing many, many clauses. There are some good aspects to the bill, but there are also some clauses that are rather questionable.

We appreciated the finance minister's willingness to listen. He was unaware that one section of the bill threatened mail delivery to rural libraries and to the visually impaired. He listened. We proposed an amendment and saved the day for rural libraries.

Could my colleague give us an example of an amendment from her party that improved Bill C-15?

• (1720)

[*English*]

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, to address the member's comments at the beginning, I wholeheartedly agree that a strong opposition makes Canada overall stronger. That is what we are here to do. We are here to strengthen bills, provide amendments, improve ideas, work together and represent our constituents. The day that we stop representing our constituents, we do not belong in the House.

My speech focused on the amendments that we put forward to this particular provision that would have concentrated power, immense power, among cabinet ministers. We provided a balanced approach in our amendments.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Newmarket—Aurora spoke a moment ago about how we can collaborate together and strengthen legislation, as demonstrated by these amendments. I was wondering if the member could take a moment to speak to the importance of the scrutiny of bills that sound rather innocuous, like a budget implementation act, but are some 600 pages long. Perhaps the member could elaborate on why it is important that the opposition scrutinize legislation that is this expansive.

Sandra Cobena: Mr. Speaker, I would have loved a bit more time with this bill. It is a huge bill, not only in the number of pages but as an omnibus bill. The Henry VIII provision, in fact, should have been a stand-alone bill and taken out. However, we have ultimately tried to compromise and to continue to provide safeguards while fostering innovation. It is important for Canada, but most certainly not at the cost of a concentration of power and potential abuse.

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the budget implementation act with the fresh feedback and concerns of my constituents in mind. The riding I represent is made up of many different communities, but they are united by a lot of things, as are many Canadians. We did not get feedback just on election day. Members are in their communities, connecting with their neighbours and residents, getting feedback all the time.

There is one item, in particular, that is contained in the budget implementation act, the BIA, that has caused me to receive more feedback than any other single issue in my seven years as a parliamentarian, and that is the Alto high-speed rail project. Alto is a Crown corporation that proposes to run a high-speed train from Toronto to Quebec City, with stops in Peterborough, Ottawa and Montreal. It would pass through my region, and it is proposed to pass through my community. The overwhelming feedback that I have received is that it is going to have a detrimental effect for many people in homes, on farms and on recreational properties; for small businesses; for the environment; and for historic sites. I want to get into a couple of those things.

This high-speed rail project will have a train that is going to be travelling at a few hundred kilometres per hour. There will be no at-grade or level crossings, which means that, wherever a road intersects with the path of this train, it will require a vehicle overpass. This corridor, which would be up to 200 feet wide, is going to cut through the communities it is proposed to pass through, with large fences on either side, severing roads. I have not only heard feedback from my community but also spoken with the proponent, Alto, this Crown corporation, and asked if there will be overpasses at every road it intersects with. The answer was no, so this is a problem. This is going to orphan all kinds of properties and roads and create tremendous challenges with emergency response times, which are already challenging in rural areas.

It is also going to pass through the Frontenac Arch Biosphere. This is a UNESCO-recognized biosphere. The people who live in

Government Orders

the community know the many different types of rare flora and fauna that exist in the region and in the Frontenac Arch Biosphere. Heritage sites, buildings and monuments older than our country itself, including the Rideau Canal, would be disturbed, upset and destroyed by this project.

Let us think about individual properties. I have heard from hundreds of people within the proposed corridor who have said they are not going to sell. That means that there are going to be expropriations. We heard from the minister at committee this week that those properties will be acquired this year. With a project of this scale, which is supposed to bring Canadians together, and with all of the impacts that I have mentioned very quickly, knowing there are many more, we would expect there to be consultations in the communities it would be passing through. Did I mention that there will be no stop in my community? This is going to pass through. There is going to be no service to the region, and it is going to cost \$90 billion.

• (1725)

That is the estimate from Alto and the government, but there are many experts who are saying it will cost many orders of magnitude more than that. We are talking about a \$90-billion project, and in my community, that means thousands of dollars in cost per household for a train service with fares that many would never be able to afford, and they have not even been estimated yet. They cannot afford the prices on Via Rail currently. It is expected, and all but assured, that the prices on Alto will be higher.

With all of that, one would expect that there would have been a consultation in our community. They told us to drive to another county, to drive to another district, and that they would be happy to provide us with the pitch there. That is what they have been told. That is not a dialogue.

The people who have reached out to me own seasonal properties, some of whom will not have returned to their seasonal properties yet this year. They will find out about the consultation after the consultation period is closed. I have sent postcards to every business and residence in my riding, asking people to participate, soliciting their feedback, so I can provide it to the minister and Alto. They can fill out that survey at michaelbarrettmp.ca, my parliamentary website.

It is important that folks are able to provide their feedback about something that is going to affect them very deeply. This is about properties, businesses and homes that have been in a family for generations.

I think about the folks who have reached out to me about their grandchildren, about the next generation they hope will take on their farm with intergenerational farm transfers. They are hoping to have their business go to their children or have their grandkids play in the yard. I think about what that would mean for me, if I look at my children Luke, Ama, Michaela, James and Nathan. Amanda and I are so proud of them. Watching them grow up is our dream.

Government Orders

For someone to be told that their property is going to be taken away from them, and that they are going to be told what it is worth, so they can take it or leave it, but not to worry because it is for a really important project for infrastructure that they will never use and cannot afford to pay for, that is not the kind of thing that brings Canadians together.

We have so much work to do in Canada. We have so much work to do to build projects that would unite us. We are a country rich in natural resources, but we do not have the infrastructure to get them to tidewater. We have areas that are looking for very specific transit projects that would help people in dense urban areas. They are looking for projects like this in corridors that exist. That is not what we are seeing here. What we are seeing is a proposal that would violate the rights of many thousands of Canadians, and they are not even being asked what they think about it.

When a Crown corporation is prepared to expropriate properties in a community but is not prepared to go to the community first to meet people where they live, that is not something that is being done with the best interest of Canadians in mind.

I do not have a property that is in the corridor, but I represent a community that has many who do. When I think about my kids, I think about their kids. I think about people who work tirelessly just to afford the dream of home ownership or to be able to have a roof over their head, to farm the land, to feed our country.

I am opposed to Alto HSR, and I am going to vote against it. It is for my community. It is for this generation. It is for the next. It is for Canada.

• (1730)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for a moment there, I thought I was back on Hamilton city council on the planning committee. Every single time a project comes forward, we hear the exact same rhetoric from retail politicians who want to stand in the way because it is politically expedient.

Every single industrialized economy in the world, except for maybe the U.S., whether it is Europe, China or Japan, has a high-speed rail network that brings their country together as an alternative to air travel.

Why not take a leadership role to make this project the best that it can be for one's community, instead of just taking the easy way out to say one is opposed and get in the way?

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, the corridor that is being proposed to be serviced has a well-established highway, the 401. We also, in that same corridor, have Via Rail service. We are not talking about enhancing the service that exists and taking cars off the road that way. Via Rail continues to reduce service offerings.

Instead, what is being proposed is not, as the member offers, a service to folks in my community. It is quite the opposite. It is a disservice to them at their own expense. I cannot abide it. This is not about not in my backyard. I do not think it should be in anyone's backyard.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague more questions about high-speed rail and the contents of Bill C-15, which takes rights away from expropriated individuals.

Last week, I attended high-speed rail consultations in the town of Berthier, in my riding, near Joliette. I witnessed a massive mobilization effort by farmers, who are deeply concerned.

The government says that a corridor 10 kilometres wide is planned to decide where the high-speed rail will run. The government is also suspending existing remedies, and if something happens to any of the farm buildings, renovating or replacing them will not be possible for years.

Farmers also want to know if overpasses will be provided to allow them to cross this potential route. They recalled that it took many years before they got one in my area. They suspect that none will be provided.

Does this part of Bill C-15 show a lack of respect for our farmers?

• (1735)

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of concerns about this bill.

[*English*]

The expropriations that we are talking about are going to affect many people. This is something that I specifically asked in this case: Would they guarantee that people would continue to be able to travel in the same way? Being able to get a car over top of an overpass is one thing, but what about combines, large farming equipment, tractor-trailers and 18-wheelers?

The consultation process is not being done in earnest. I cannot believe that at a time when we need to protect our food sovereignty, this kind of disrespect would be shown to agricultural producers and farmers in this country. We cannot abide it.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I respect and applaud the member beside me for coming out with such a strong statement against Alto.

I understand that we share similar riding demographics, and both our ridings are affected by this project. Could the member elaborate on some of the concerns and/or feedback he is getting from his constituents and why, in the role of opposition, he is so able to speak against it?

Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the hon. member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga because I know that her community is rightly concerned as well. The hon. member has also expressed her concerns about and opposition to this project because of the effects that it is going to have on private properties, farms, small businesses, homes, heritage sites and the environment, with no benefit to those in the community, and at great cost.

Government Orders

I appreciate that we have that opportunity, but it is such an important role we play in His Majesty's loyal opposition to be able to offer the alternative view, and to be able to stand up for our constituents and for Canadians. I applaud her for her work in doing that.

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things I could talk about when it comes to the budget from the perspective of the challenges it brings. The first thing we can look at, of course, is the fact that there is \$78 billion in new debt being created for future taxpayers.

What I would like to do tonight, because I have had the opportunity to speak to some of those things before, is speak directly to the veterans in this country, to their families and to the people who support our veterans. That is because, while the government is spending \$78 billion that it does not have, the one place, or one of the very few places, where it has decided to cut very deeply, frankly, are services for our veterans.

The one place where we should not have those kinds of cuts, the one place where every penny that is deserved should go, is to the services for those men and women who have served this country, in many cases have bled or given their limbs. That is the place where the government decided to find cuts. That is the one place it decided to take from: from the veterans who have given everything for this country.

It saddens me, frankly, to even have to talk about this. What we know at this point is that there are about \$4 billion in cuts in the budget when it comes to our veterans. The government will not admit to that. In fact, when the Minister of Veterans Affairs was asked about the cuts that are widely reported in the media and widely acknowledged by everyone except for the government, the Minister of Veterans Affairs said the government is not making cuts but is investing in veterans.

However, it is very clear in the budget that \$4 billion in cuts to veterans are coming. When the government is not even willing to be open and honest and admit to what the cuts are, it leaves veterans, their family members and the people who support our veterans wondering what they will be. What cuts are they going to face? Obviously, that has almost a worse impact than knowing what those cuts will be.

The government has admitted to one of the cuts it will be making. It has said that it is going to cut the reimbursement rate for cannabis. It has tried to claim that this would in fact make up the whole \$4 billion in cuts. We are talking about a program that is a little over \$200 million a year, and the government will be cutting the reimbursement rate by about a quarter. I am not sure how those numbers add up. Maybe there is some math I am not understanding. The government says it will be lifetime costs and those kinds of things, but that is a lot of pot over a long period of time. Clearly that is not an accurate representation of what the cuts are.

What we have been able to learn through scouring the budget and through some of the things we have been hearing from veterans in the veteran community is that there seem to be about about five different areas thus far where we have been able to determine there are some cuts coming to services for veterans. I want to speak a little bit to those cuts and what their impact will be.

The first one, of course, is that the government is changing pension indexing for disabled RCMP veterans, which is going to result in lower pensions over time for those veterans. This is buried on, I think, page 441 of the budget. The government is going to retroactively change the legislation to avoid paying back to veterans who were in long-term care money that they were overcharged.

I mentioned already that the government is making a cut to the reimbursement rate for medical cannabis. What we are hearing from many veterans is that this will mean the products they have been able to use, which have been helpful to them, may not be available to them any longer because of that change in the rate. That will possibly put them down paths they do not want to end up on.

● (1740)

We are also hearing about repayments being demanded from veterans of their income replacement benefits. Veterans, numbering into the thousands, have received letters from the government telling them they must repay immediately thousands of dollars paid to them with respect to their disability status. We have heard of instances of over \$100,000 that veterans are being asked to repay. It is being taken right out of their disability pension and other things.

Imagine the impact this is going to have on a disabled veteran. We are talking about the most vulnerable veterans, the ones who need it the most, frankly. They are having it taken away from them when they are already living on a fixed budget and a fixed income. Of course, with the inflation and everything else we have seen over the last 10 years under the Liberal government, they are already in a really difficult spot. This will likely put out on the street veterans who are not there now.

This is the kind of thing we are talking about, heartless sorts of cuts, when the Liberals are spending money on all kinds of things. We heard my colleague just now talk about one example of that, but there are many, and then they choose to go after disabled veterans and those who are in long-term care. That is how the Liberals are trying to make up the money they are wasting elsewhere.

We have heard recently as well that there are layoffs coming at what is called the Bureau of Pensions Advocates. For people who are not familiar with the process that veterans go through, I want to talk about that for a moment. I am being told by the people who are involved that ultimately that is going to mean likely two years or more in delays for veterans to have their cases or their appeals heard at the Veterans Review and Appeal Board.

Government Orders

It is important at this point that I explain what veterans deal with when they put in an application to the government. Veterans often talk about delays, denials and being put off until, the government hopes, they give up and go away. The amount of time it can take is not measured in weeks or in months. It is measured in years, in most cases, for a veteran to get just their most basic claims they need for disability benefits or other things approved, or not. Often it takes actually going through an appeal process that then takes more years at the Veterans Review and Appeal Board before veterans finally are able to hopefully get, in most cases, at least when it gets to that point, the benefits they are entitled to.

Now there is talk about laying off people at the Bureau of Pensions Advocates. They are the people who represent veterans because the amount of paperwork, bureaucracy and red tape required to go through the process is too much to manage. These are essentially lawyers who are available to veterans in order to deal with all that. When people are laid off at the Bureau of Pensions Advocates, it is going to mean delays for thousands of veterans. Roughly 10,000 cases are heard every year there. What I am hearing is that it is going to cut in half the number of cases that can be heard, which means that thousands of veterans this year will not have their case heard, will not get the benefits they need and therefore will not be able to move on with their life.

What we are talking about is a government that is going to run a \$78-billion deficit, on top of hundreds of billions of dollars it has already added to the debt. The one place the government chooses to cut is for the veterans, the men and women who have bled, given their limbs and their lives in some cases, for this country. The Liberals would tell disabled veterans and those in long-term care, once again just like Justin Trudeau once told them, that they are asking for more than we can give.

Frankly, the men and women who serve this country in uniform deserve everything they are entitled to. If this is the one place where the heartless government is going to cut, when it would spend \$78 billion of taxpayer money that it does not have, that is shameful and disgraceful, and I cannot stand for it.

• (1745)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not buy into what the member suggests the government has done. I sat in opposition in the third party when Stephen Harper, along with the current leader of the Conservative Party, literally shut down veterans offices across Canada, including in my home province of Manitoba. I do not think there are any lessons to be learned from the Conservative Party on that issue.

One of the member's colleagues talked about how Canadians want to see action, and that is exactly what they have seen since the last election, whether it is building one Canadian economy, looking at export opportunities through international enhancement of trade relations, or this particular budget.

Can the member appreciate the effort in building one Canadian economy that is stronger and healthier?

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, there it is again. I mentioned it. The Liberals deny they are even making the cuts, and then they blame everybody else. They go back and blame a prime minister

who was in office more than 10 years ago for the cuts being made today.

The Liberals do not even want to admit to these cuts, but they are taking away from disabled veterans and from veterans who are in long-term care, while spending \$78 billion of taxpayers' money that they do not even have today. It is future taxpayers' money. One place they will cut is funding for disabled veterans and veterans in long-term care.

That is shameful and disgraceful, and it is sad to see a member on that side stand up and try to defend it, because that is disgraceful.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague that veterans deserve our utmost respect and much better treatment, as do many other people in our society, including people with disabilities and seniors. It is hard to invest properly to help them. Let me explain.

My colleague talked about cost overruns and the Liberals' tendency to mismanage things. Phoenix and ArriveCAN were mentioned today as examples. Now the Cúram software project is way over budget. It seems like the government is losing control of these programs. That means less money is available to help people in need.

Can my colleague comment on that?

• (1750)

[*English*]

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, what the member has touched on here highlights the biggest problem that we see. I spoke tonight to the veterans' situation, but there are a lot of other reasons to be concerned about what is going on here.

At the end of the day, the most important thing to point out here is that the deficits and debt being created lead to inflation, and that inflation harms the people who are the most vulnerable in our society. It is not just veterans who are living on fixed incomes; it is also seniors, as the member mentioned. It is people who are lower-income. They are affected the most.

We hear about the millions of people in this country who are now going to food banks who were not going before. That is a result of the kind of policies we have seen over the last 10 years under the Liberal government, and it is time for it to come to an end.

Government Orders

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a 605-clause bill. The member did not even have time to get into all the detail of the veterans components. I want to give him time to unpack what the Liberals have done with respect to the reimbursement of veterans.

There is a 1998 law that the department has not followed for 28 years. The Liberals are losing in court to veterans who are suing them to get the proper compensation. The Liberals' reaction is to go backward and amend a 28-year-old law in order to give them legal cover to continue to undercompensate veterans. It is Orwellian: "Who controls the present controls the past."

I wonder if the member could comment on that.

Blake Richards: Mr. Speaker, that is an important point that I did not get a chance to speak to.

This was a mistake that was made by the Liberals. They are going back to veterans who are in long-term care in one case, and to veterans who are disabled in another. They are demanding repayment in one case. The Liberals are retroactively changing legislation to avoid having to reimburse the veterans they were overcharging for long-term care. For years they were overcharged. The Liberals are retroactively changing the legislation not only to avoid a lawsuit but also to avoid paying back veterans who are in long-term care. It is sad.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what have Liberals given Canadians after 10 years? They have forced 2.2 million Canadians to food banks in a single month. They have ensured that Canada has the most indebted households in the entire G7. They have made sure that food inflation is the highest in the entire G7.

After causing all of that and knowing they caused all that, the first thing the Liberals are trying to do in this budget implementation act is to give unlimited powers to their ministers, and to do what? It is so they can reward, behind backdoor shady deals, and give Liberal-connected insiders, whether individuals or companies like Brookfield, contracts that would be void of and could avoid the Conflict of Interest Act.

In fact, the Liberals wanted to give unlimited powers to ministers and the Prime Minister to give contracts to any entity or company that would avoid any act of Parliament, including the Conflict of Interest Act, or anything except something that would break the Criminal Code. These could be shady backroom deals.

We have seen this with the Liberals before. While this country is being hit with high inflation and a crime rate that is out of control because of soft-on-crime Liberal policies, and after knowing all of that, this was what the Liberals wanted to do. It shows where the Prime Minister and the Liberal government's priorities are. They are not with Canadians. They are once again for Liberals and well-connected Liberal insiders.

The Prime Minister said a lot of things during the election, but I want to highlight some of the things he said he would do. He said that he was the guy, and that if he was elected, he would fix all the problems that 10 years of the Liberals created. In fact, a Liberal is a Liberal, and he liberalised once again. His promises or rhetoric would never match what reality is for Canadians.

This is the guy who says to judge him by the price of food at the grocery store. What ended up happening after he said that? Canada now has the highest food inflation in the entire G7. It is the highest. In fact, it is double what it is in the U.S., and I hear the Liberals being happy about that. They do not care that there are moms who have to double-check and triple-check the price of food now before they buy it, that they have to starve themselves or choose less nutritious food for their children because of how high food inflation is in Canada after 10 years of the Liberals' failed policies.

What did the Liberals do in this budget? They could have done a lot in this budget to help bring down food prices. Remember, it was the current finance minister, right before Thanksgiving 2023, who tried to put on this strong act and said he was going to call all the CEOs from the grocery stores, tell them what was on his mind and tell them the way it is, and that after that, grocery prices would come down. Thanksgiving 2023, Thanksgiving 2024 and Thanksgiving 2025 went by, and the only thing that happened was that Canada got the highest food inflation in the G7. This is the track record of the government.

Once again they talked a big game, but the reality for Canadians did not match the big rhetoric coming out of the Liberals' mouths. The Prime Minister, again, said that he was the guy who should be judged by the prices at the grocery store. The verdict is out, and it is very expensive. It is one of the reasons 2.2 million Canadians are visiting a food bank in a single month now, a third of whom are children. Children are starving in this country. I cannot believe we are talking about this in a first world country like Canada. This is the reality, where people who used to volunteer at food banks are now standing in line at the food bank, waiting for food, because they are hungry. Once again the Prime Minister's rhetoric did not match what the reality of Canadians is today.

● (1755)

This is the same Prime Minister who said he was going to get a deal with Trump, that he was the guy. Canadians should elect him and watch his elbows go up. What happened after that? He continued the same failed policies of Justin Trudeau, who for 10 years was blocking our resources and making sure that nothing got built in this country. It is the same reason Canada is not the strong, sovereign, independent country and energy superpower that it should be today. It is because the Prime Minister doubled down on those same policies. He said he signed a piece of paper saying they intend and want pipelines to be built, but the same policies that were passed that do not let anything get built in this country are still there, and they will continue to be there because this eco-radical government's ideology will not let them get anything built.

Government Orders

We should have had pipelines built. We could have had mines built. In fact, when I talked to a mining company in B.C., they said it takes something like 18 years to get a mine approved. Who wants to invest in Canada and pump in all this money for 18 years to maybe get a permit approved for a mine? It is ridiculous. This is why more than \$600 billion of good Canadian investment has fled to the U.S. in 10 years under the Liberals. The Prime Minister is no different, because close to \$60 billion of Canadian investment fled to the U.S. once he became Prime Minister.

There is no investment environment left in Canada for people to see any type of return, because the same failed policies, like Bill C-69, the “no new pipelines” bill, are still there. Bill C-48, which does not let our product leave the west coast, is still there. The industrial carbon tax, which also contributes to higher grocery prices, is still there. While I am talking about grocery prices, the Liberals have still not gotten rid of the food packaging tax, which adds an extra \$1 billion in costs on food every single year. That is not in this budget. In fact, they promised in this budget that food prices would go up, because the industrial carbon tax would go up. When it comes to our energy sector, the industrial carbon tax is still there and does more harm than good. The Liberals do not really have a plan.

All of this is the reason Canada is so reliant on the U.S. We are reliant on other countries. We know the stories. When our allies came to us, looking for our good, low-carbon energy, these guys turned them away, saying there was no business case. We still do not have a case, because nothing is getting built in this country. Under the Liberals, nothing will get built in this country. Then the Prime Minister said they were going to build at speeds not seen since World War II, yet, according to their own housing agency, every single year they miss their targets. They are well below their targets.

Instead of putting foundations into the ground, the only thing that these guys have created in this budget is a fourth bureaucracy. After they spent over \$90 billion on housing, housing is more expensive than ever. In fact, youth do not now think they will ever be able to afford a house unless they have the bank of mom and dad. That is the reality after 10 years of the Liberal government. We need to turn all of that around and bring hope back to this country.

Under the leadership of our leader, that is what the Conservatives will do. We need to get our resources to market and get rid of these bad Liberal laws that are anti-development, anti-growth and anti-resources. We need to get those out of the way so we can produce more here and sell more, so we are not only independent but self-reliant and can become an energy superpower once again, as we used to be.

Conservatives are going to get all the gatekeepers out of the way so we can get more homes built in this country. We are going to stop the out-of-control deficits, like the ones the government continues to have, that make taxes go up. We will bring down everyone's taxes and make sure inflation does not get out of control like it does under the Liberals, so Canadians can keep more in their pockets and spend more on what they want to spend it on.

A Conservative government is also going to bring back safe streets, something the entire country is crying for. That will happen under the Conservatives.

• (1800)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think if Canadians wanted to understand exactly why the Conservative Party lost a 25-point lead in the last election, they could look at the member's speech here this afternoon. Even in Alberta, recent polling is showing a tightening and Liberals being competitive in ridings such as the riding of the member opposite. I do not know if there is anything that they will bring to the table that is new. That is really unfortunate, because we just heard members opposite being collaborative and willing to work together for the betterment of Canadians. Frankly, it is embarrassing, this kind of rhetoric in the House of Commons. It is nothing but a word salad of catchphrases and Conservative talking points.

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I would invite the member to come to my riding and to come to Alberta, because if I were to repeat what my constituents are saying about his government, I would probably get kicked out of this place. My constituents are the ones who are suffering from 10 years of bad Liberal policy. It is my province that always gets kicked down by the Liberals.

Albertans are giving. We have always been giving, but we just want the federal government to get out of the way, and the Liberal government refuses to do that. That is why our energy production is not there. That is why we cannot get any resources built. I seriously am inviting the member to come door knocking in my riding so he can hear what my constituents are actually saying.

• (1805)

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the end of his speech, my colleague mentioned the Prime Minister's interests in Brookfield and his other investments. I would like to ask him a question about the governance choices the Prime Minister is making and the potential benefits to Brookfield, for example.

One example is his elimination of the minimum tax for American companies that use tax havens. Brookfield had just moved its headquarters from Toronto to New York to take advantage of this. His Bill C-15 eliminates the tax on web giants. However, we know that he has a stake in web giants.

With regard to all the subsidies the Prime Minister will be giving to industries and how these align with economic development, does my colleague believe that there is sufficient separation between his decisions and his interests?

Government Orders

[English]

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I actually enjoyed my time together with the member on the finance committee when he was there, and he is absolutely right. It is this trend under the Prime Minister. He obviously has conflicts with Brookfield, yet one of the first things the government tried to do within the budget implementation act was give itself unlimited power, so the Prime Minister, behind closed doors, could give Brookfield a government contract from taxpayers without having to go through the conflict of interest test. That is literally what the government tried to do. I thank God that we, as Conservatives, stopped that from happening and put safeguards there.

Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member actually highlighted quite a few things. One thing I would like to ask him about is in regard to the government. The Liberals have been in power for a year under the Prime Minister and 10 years under the previous government. What does Canada look like after 10 years of mismanagement, and how is that impacting his province and morale in his province?

Jasraj Hallan: Mr. Speaker, it is clear to see that the stats speak for themselves in Canada after 11 years or 10 years of Liberal governments. It does not matter who is at the head. It is still the same ministers, it is still the same House leader and it is still the same ideology, and 2.2 million Canadians are visiting a food bank in a single month. There are more children hungry today than there were 10 years ago.

When the member was a part of the Stephen Harper government, we had a very rich middle class, and that middle class is becoming poorer and poorer. In fact, the gap between the rich and the poor is getting wider now. That is not something that we should be seeing in a first world country, but under the Liberals that is what we are seeing now. Canada used to be the envy of the world. In fact, I remember that when the member was a part of the Stephen Harper government, in 2014, there was an article that said that the American dream is in Canada now. Just two years ago, there was a paper that said that the Canadian dream is gone and has fled to the U.S. That is the difference.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I usually begin a speech by saying it is an honour or a pleasure to stand to speak to the bill before us, but I am so deeply appalled and offended by what has been going on in this place since June that I have a hard time speaking without the rage making my voice tremble.

Bill C-15, the omnibus budget bill, is offensive at every level. It is very much an omnibus bill. A budget implementation bill is supposed to implement a budget and not contain surprises, things that were not in the budget and were not even mentioned. However, we are presented with them here and it is all supposed to be fast-tracked. It was fast-tracked by a UC motion, and it was done on Friday the 13th when I was unable to object to the fast-tracking of this bill. I do not regret going to Tumbler Ridge. It was important to be there together with the other party leaders, but I deeply regret that the governing party chose that moment to put forward a unanimous consent motion to fast-track the review of this bill at report stage and third reading.

It is, as we have heard and as Canadians have heard, a bill of over 600 pages. I remember the omnibus budget bill of spring 2012, Bill C-38. I was appalled when Stephen Harper tried to push it through and did in fact push it through. It took longer to debate, in fairness, but it was over 400 pages. The omnibus budget implementation act of spring 2012 was over 400 pages. Here we have the omnibus budget bill to budget 2025-26 and it is over 600 pages, with much of it, as I said, unanticipated. It touches on more than 20 different laws, bills as diverse as anything we have heard of. It deals with the fast-tracked expropriation of lands next to Alto high-speed rail. I support high-speed rail, but I think we needed more time to study this in the House.

We have changes made here to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. My attempts to put forward amendments to that in the finance committee were summarily defeated, but we never properly discussed them. The public has not heard as much as a peep about the things in this budget implementation act, Bill C-15, which would change things for the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, weakening environmental protections, particularly around a practice that has been under way since 1988. The act has been around for a long time.

To change it to say we want equivalency with the provinces so that we do not duplicate is a good thing, but it needs to be reviewed now and then. This bill says, no, we are never going to review it. That is it. There is no sunset on that. Equivalency goes forward. A lot of environmental law experts would have liked to testify to that. They would have liked to testify at the environment committee about that, but no amendments occurred to the changes to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act that are included in Bill C-15.

It is egregious, as we have heard from other speakers here tonight, and I should remember the names of the members who spoke so eloquently to the changes that are being made to veterans' rights. I know the member for Vancouver Kingsway mentioned it. We have here in this bill retroactive changes to avoid legislative changes to help our veterans in long-term care have access to the reimbursements to which they are entirely entitled. We are doing a quickie on that one.

Before they can turn around, members will find that this bill also includes a number of time machines. We never had time to talk about it in this place, but Bill C-4, which is currently before the Senate, in part 4, changes privacy rights under the Elections Act. That is a doozy, by the way. We never got to debate that in this place. The bill will enter into force when the Senate is finished with it, and it will enter into force 26 years ago, because it enters into force in the year 2000. Things are being done in this place that should scandalize the members of the House, because they are profoundly anti-democratic. They represent power grabs.

Government Orders

Bill C-5, which was rushed through in June, of course, was the first time any prime minister in Canada has ever used the King Henry VIII clause to say that if something in the bill breaks other laws we have already passed, that is okay. I was not prepared for this to show up when I was reading this monstrous bill and to find in division 5, well over 500 pages in, that Bill C-15 put forward the notion that, unlike in Bill C-5 where the cabinet as a whole could break other laws, an individual minister, at his or her discretion, in areas within his or her jurisdiction, could exempt any entity from the application of any law except the Criminal Code.

• (1810)

I want to thank the hon. member for Newmarket—Aurora, who put forward the amendments in committee that would make this less bad, but in case anyone's wondering, spoiler alert, I am not going to vote for this. It is less bad, but it is still pretty awful. I cannot vote for a bill that would say that any minister can exempt an entity from acts except for a listed few, even though the ones listed are good.

On this notion of regulatory sandboxes, as far as I'm concerned and despite the fact that committee members were told in finance committee by Treasury Board officials that regulatory sandboxes are normal and routine and that we should all be used to them by now, I cannot support it. They come from the U.K., the Tory government and the Bank of England, where regulatory sandboxes were initiated in order to innovate financial instruments, services and products and were exempted from laws to be able to innovate and experiment.

I do not mind it so much, although innovation in financial instruments is what led to the collapse of the housing market in the U.S. by bundling together worthless mortgage papers and calling it a product, but it is more dangerous when they are playing with our health and environment.

We do not have any way of really regulating what is going on, even with the admirable work of the member for Newmarket—Aurora. The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway referred to it as a “backroom deal”. No doubt that is what happened. It makes this slightly less awful. It would mean that before a minister exempts an entity from the application of a law, there must be a 30-day public consultation period. Unlike the original version of this act that said that the minister will make it public as soon as it is “feasible” but with no timeline on that, thanks to amendments in committee it is now within 30 days that it must be made public. However, that does not allow me to vote for this bill.

The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway also pointed out, and I will certainly vote for those amendments, that this bill would do away with the digital services tax. While that was not as much of a surprise, given the budget, as other things, and I think regulatory sandboxes were never foreshadowed, certainly in the election campaign, we were told it was “elbows up”. It was subsequent to that, but before the budget, that our elbows dropped when Donald Trump said that he did not like the fact that Canadians were bringing in a digital services tax.

We were doing that in concert with colleagues through the European Union. We need to get a hold of these digital giants that are ripping off our private information for their own profit. We need to

have a way of holding them to account. They are eroding our democracy and attacking our public media and newspapers.

I remember a prominent Liberal and respected former minister in this place, the hon. Lloyd Axworthy, who called it “bootlicking” when Trump said that he did not like the digital services tax and the Prime Minister said that we will get rid of it really quickly. I am too nice to say that, but I can quote Lloyd Axworthy saying it.

I find it deeply worrying that we now have to pass an omnibus budget bill in quick fashion, because it has to be done by later tonight. We all know that is the plan. It is going to be whizzed through, because they whizzed through that process in the unanimous consent motion of February 13.

I find this bill deeply offensive. There would be changes to CEPA without proper analysis and study and changes to the digital services tax without us even debating in this place the fact that we are repealing a law that we passed to bring it into effect. We would lose the oversight under the Red Tape Reduction Act. One would have never expected us to bring in the right for any individual minister to exempt an entity from a law, which still remains in place in this bill but with more safeguards and somewhat more transparency.

• (1815)

When I consider all the things that comprise this giant, over 600-page bill, I am offended. I will vote no, and I urge my fellow members to make it less bad by supporting the amendments from the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, coming out of the election, whether it was the Prime Minister or the government of the day, we made some significant commitments to Canadians. We have, for example, the one Canada economy, Bill C-5, which the Green Party voted against. We have the issue of the budget, which is a major aspect of any government. It establishes priorities. The Green Party is voting against the budget implementation bill.

My question is on a third point, which is the idea of increasing international trade opportunities. A great deal of resources and efforts are moving in that direction as we build stronger infrastructure within Canada. We are also complementing that by looking for additional trade that goes beyond the Canada-U.S. borders. I am interested in the member's thoughts on the issue of international trade and if Canada is moving in the right direction from her perspective.

Government Orders

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I would say this quickly to my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North. As he knows, I am the only opposition party member who voted for the budget itself. I largely did that because the budget, on page 348, committed that the eligible uses for investment tax credits would not include “enhanced oil recovery”. It was 10 days after I voted for the budget that the memorandum of understanding with Alberta said to forget that thing written in the budget. I know it is not in disappearing ink as I still see it here in the budget, but the reverse has been promised to Danielle Smith of Alberta.

I support that we friendshore. I support what the former deputy leader Chrystia Freeland said, which is that democracies need democracies, not dictators. Therefore, it bothers me if our international trading partners are Saudi Arabia—

• (1820)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to continue questions and comments.

The hon. member for Northumberland—Clarke.

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member and I disagree on many things. However, two things we share is that we both support trains and the environment, so my question will deal with both.

One of the concerns I have with high-speed rail is the environmental impact it will have, especially given the relatively brief amount of time. Could she share any concerns? Part of it is in my riding and there are some very sensitive areas there.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, as has also been pointed out by another colleague from the member's bench, some of the high-speed rail will impact sensitive areas. The problem with building everything fast is this.

[*Translation*]

I can say it in French. I asked a Bloc Québécois colleague what the French word for “bulldozer” is. It is the same word.

[*English*]

We are seeing a lot of bulldozing over process, procedure, democracy and ecosystems. It goes hand in hand.

[*Translation*]

I think there are some problems with this omnibus bill.

[*English*]

I agree with my colleague that we should study it. We want rail across Canada, but we need to know what we are getting into.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the speech by my colleague, who is the leader of the Green Party and the only Green Party member in the House. Her voice is very important.

Bill C-15 gives a lot of power to ministers and the executive branch to suspend all laws, aside from the Criminal Code.

Does my colleague think that is a clear signal that anything to do with environmental legislation or the protection of species at risk is being set aside by the Carney government to pass—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member. Members cannot use the Prime Minister's name in the House.

I will let the hon. member finish her question.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely right. It must be the late hour. I am tired.

Does my colleague think that, through Bill C-15, the current Liberal government is signalling a lack of interest in the environment and in environmental protection?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my esteemed colleague from the Bloc Québécois. It is clear. The proof is there. We have no indication that the current government will uphold environmental laws protecting endangered species.

It is clear from Bill C-5 and Bill C-15 that those things do not matter. The only thing that matters is the bulldozers.

[*English*]

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in this House, as it is every time. I would like to start, if I could, by giving a quick congratulations to both my son and my daughter, who made it to Speechfest at their school. They obviously got that oratory ability from their mother, not from me. I congratulate James and Maggie.

Of course, the substance of today's debate is the budget implementation act. I will be focusing on an area that particularly affects my riding of Northumberland—Clarke, and that is the Alto high-speed rail. My speech will mostly just be a direct conveyance of the comments that I have received from my riding on the potential impact of the expropriation and the abridgement of the private property rights of many of the property owners along the route.

Just so that people understand, the idea of having a high-speed rail service from Montreal to Quebec City, Ottawa and Toronto, stopping in Peterborough, the great city of Peterborough I might add, is an encouraging thing. That is a positive thing. If people could make it from Ottawa to Toronto in two hours, that is a positive thing, but there are significant challenges. I will go through some of the concerns that some of my residents have raised.

Number one is the impact it would have on their property. In some cases, there are individuals who have farms that have been their family's property for multiple generations, some going as far back as Confederation. That would end. Their property would be bisected, in many cases, by the proposed route. We still do not know what the final route is. I thank the minister for being direct and saying that the final route will be announced before the end of this year. That is positive.

Government Orders

What is not positive is that the minister, to my questions at committee, was not able to give any specific or concrete answers to questions such as these: When will expropriation begin, and how much notice will be given? Members can imagine being one of the residents of Northumberland County who has owned a farm through multiple generations and seeing a bill that proposes that, within a year, they will go from owning their property, which their family has owned for the last 150 years, to a point where it will be expropriated. The least the government could have done was give a defined process to these individuals before announcing the potential expropriation of their property. This should have been announced all at once, so people would be given notice and given a process.

The minister repeated over and over that this would just be common sense. Common sense is not quite good enough for someone whose entire life is wrapped around a rural community. That is where I have lived my whole life. It might be the same in urban communities, but I know for a fact that, in rural communities, people are very much defined by the property they own, the dirt that is underneath their feet. For someone to literally pull that rug from underneath them is a very scary proposition. In addition to that, for those folks who were not directly affected, the indirect impacts could be huge.

Therefore, like I said, I completely agree that being able to jump on a high-speed train going from Montreal to Toronto in three hours, or whatever the time will be exactly, is positive. What is not positive is if someone lives north of the proposed route and they need to get to Northumberland Hills Hospital, which is in the great city of Cobourg. Their drive could go from a 30- or 40-minute drive to two or three hours. The minister could not even tell me, and nor will Alto as of yet, where the crossings will be.

Let me explain. In my area, quite a few people live north of where the route would be, but there is a lot of the infrastructure for those various communities, including the Northumberland Hills Hospital, Highway 401 and, actually, the VIA train, and there are major routes that link those to the rest of the community.

They would put a steel fence all the way along the proposed route, which the minister said is only 60 metres, but it is still 60 metres. Regardless, even if it were just one metre, it is the idea of bisecting a community. Instead of driving directly to that hospital when their child has a fever or their dad has had a heart attack, people would then have to drive that extra time, which we do not know. It could be half an hour. It could be an hour to the east or the west to get to the hospital. It could literally mean the difference between life and death.

• (1825)

That is at the very extreme, but there are also other inconveniences that people in my riding, and in much of rural Quebec and rural Ontario, will have to deal with. There will be many instances where there are students on one side of the high-speed rail and their school on the other, which would lead to extended bus rides. It could go from a 10-minute bus ride to an hour bus ride. These are obviously a couple trips a day that we are now extending.

We also have our farmers, who might have their co-op, which is where a lot of farmers get their seed and their fertilizer. They will then have their fields on the other side. Once again, that can be re-

ally challenging because they are not always driving their truck. They could be driving their combine or their tractor. How are they going to get around that? Anyone who has driven a combine or been behind one knows they do not go particularly fast. Are they going to take an extra two or three hours in the middle of harvest?

Those of us who live in rural Canada would get this. Farmers will work around the clock during harvest season because they are at the mercy of Mother Nature for when they can harvest. While it is admirable to save people in Montreal and Toronto a couple of hours back and forth, it is anything but admirable to make rural students in Ontario and Quebec add hours to their day on buses. It is anything less than admirable to make Canada less able to feed ourselves because our farmers are less efficient since they have to drive for hours and hours.

In some cases, their same fields will actually be bisected. They will have to harvest one side and then find a crossing. The minister would not tell me if it will be an hour away or two hours away. We would be reducing their ability to be successful and reducing our ability to feed ourselves as Canadians. These are substantial challenges as we go forward and look at some of these issues.

I just want to read a couple of comments, specifically with respect to some of these questions. These are comments from some of my residents who have emailed or sent notes on social media: "It is extremely shocking to hear the minister speak in this manner, showing so little consideration and an apparent lack of understanding of his own territory. Telling citizens to 'go meet with Alto' when these...are merely courtesy information sessions—where staff...take notes without any real decision-making authority—is deeply frustrating."

This is well put, too. The minister, throughout my questioning, kept putting it back on the residents, kept saying for them to go to Alto. Who is in charge here? I understand that the minister is ultimately in charge and that he should have the ultimate say.

One of my residents actually sums it up very nicely when he writes, "Why is it up to the people who live in these affected areas to tell Alto which roads and amenities are essential? Should this not be part of their own research done in consultation with municipalities prior to choosing a route? I've attended Alto sessions. They have no answers, only vague promises to do right by rural residents. I find this entire process to be disingenuous and flawed."

Government Orders

Another comment says, “Thank you for this. If you have any further opportunity to ask questions, it would be important that Alto consults regarding the impacts of road severances and travel times for emergency services after the route has been chosen so that townships and residents can give more precise feedback.” The comment continues, “In the video it sounds like they are simply relying on this phase and public consultations to tell them about that.” The person commenting thinks they should be doing extensive research into these matters before making decisions.

They go on and they talk about the various ways this will affect people's lives. We understand and, like I said, it is admirable that we should be making life more convenient for the citizens of Toronto and Montreal, but let us not forget about the citizens of rural Quebec and rural Ontario.

• (1830)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the general acknowledgment that high-speed rail is a positive thing for Canada as a nation-building exercise, as a transportation corridor and as an economic building opportunity to use Canadian steel, Canadian labour and Canadian skilled trades.

I really take to heart his comments about the impacts on the communities he represents. I have worked in construction for 20 years. I have been a part of the planning process at the municipal level. What it really comes down to is building trust with communities in the proponent and also ensuring that, when there are mitigation measures that come forward, they are actually implemented and taken seriously.

How can we help the member make sure that this happens in his community?

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the sincere question. The number one thing that will defeat fear is information. What we have been lacking, and what our residents have been lacking, is information.

We understand there are some commercial realities, but if the government is threatening to potentially take away people's farms, which have been in their families for four or five generations, sometimes since Confederation, the government owes it to those people to tell them when they will get notice, how much notice they will get and what potential compensation they will get. That is owed to people who will live on either side of this rail. They need to know how they will get to the hospital and where the crossings will be.

That information is not there. We cannot just forget about the people in rural Ontario and rural Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-15 continues a trend we have been seeing with this government. I have been trying to form an opinion on this omnibus bill, on all the laws that amend other laws, particularly with regard to the high-speed rail issue. My colleague mentioned that in his speech, and I will come back to it.

It is a bit absurd that we are talking about this when the Bloc Québécois proposed simple amendments, some specifically aimed at allowing victims of disasters to rebuild. There is a gap in this bill on that issue. The amendment was rejected by the Liberal Party, with the support of the Conservatives. The same thing happened with the provision limiting people's ability to challenge expropriations. The Liberals, with the support of the Conservatives, have made it so that land can be expropriated for the high-speed rail project without the landowners being given the same rights as those whose land is expropriated for other infrastructure projects.

In short, it is clear that the Bloc Québécois made some really good proposals to try to improve the bill. Why did the Conservatives refuse to acknowledge that these proposals would fill in the gaps?

• (1835)

[*English*]

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to work with any member of the House who is able to help me protect the rights of the residents in our communities and protect our property rights, which are so important.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I, too, share a lot of the concerns that the hon. member has spoken to, and I applaud him for his remarks in the House tonight.

We have to remember that we are in the House of the common people. We, as opposition and government, are representing the views of our constituents. I have had hundreds of thousands of contacts in my riding, which neighbours that of the gentleman to my left, and they have similar concerns.

Could the member speak to the economic realism? Is this ever going to happen? If it does happen, what will the cost be? There is so much concern, disruption and fear in the world right now, along with how much everything costs. With the troubles that people are having on a day-to-day basis just to survive, how can this project necessarily be a priority for the government?

Indeed, I respect and support infrastructure and advancing infrastructure, but there has to be some answers as to how, when and why this is happening right now.

Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this proposal, we have a \$90-billion price tag that has been floating around. I doubt very much that would be the end cost, and I think we would see substantial overrun.

When we ask the Liberals what the business case is for that, they say there is no business case. If members do not believe me, they can check media reports. We are three-quarters of the way down the tracks, as it were. They are actually hiring a bunch of consultants to do a financial analysis, so they do not believe their own numbers either.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of the good people of Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, in the beautiful interior of British Columbia.

Government Orders

Bill C-15 is an omnibus piece of legislation, and the Liberals, in their various forms of government, like in the Trudeau era and now followed by the new Prime Minister, have staked out that the omnibus is a perfectly legitimate piece of legislation. They throw essentially everything, including the kitchen sink, in there. What happens when we throw in the kitchen sink? It means we cannot keep our hands clean anymore.

One of the problems that we have in this particular bill is around the high-speed rail network act. The government is making an effort to get in front of an announcement and say, "Look at us. Look at all the great things we are doing." We will have a project with very scant details that was first announced by the previous prime minister and then re-announced by the government and cited as part of the building Canada legislation, Bill C-5. By the way, the Liberals still have not gotten around to designating it formally under the act, as is required by law.

This is a process whereby the Liberals simply say, "Look at us. Look at how great it is," and then throw the implementation, not just to the bureaucracy, but in particular to Alto, a Crown corporation with a private component that goes with it. Essentially, when it comes to the designation of a line, the government has had a very short process for communities that would see this line, if it is ever finally created, divide their towns and their streets and, as we have heard from the previous member, affect their ability to access things like health care. These are important conversations that are not to be taken lightly.

In fact, property rights are something that Conservatives believe in and stand for. We believe there should be a firm rule of law when it comes to how property rights are standardized, and obviously it is not common law solely. There is the Expropriation Act, but that is a long-standing act that decides how government should best proceed to work with property owners to have certainty, to treat them with respect and to actually give them an independent process to use to contest when expropriation happens. However, the government, in its attempt to be the hero, would simply throw all of the messiness to Alto by essentially, with Bill C-15, abridging those property rights and the normal, usual process that would be followed through the Expropriation Act.

When the minister came to committee, I asked him specifically. I said that he would give this power to Alto and essentially freeze people's property. He said that no, it was not like that, but one can imagine being a farmer who is just about to sell. They are near the end of their long career and want to be able to sell at a firm price, and suddenly they are told they cannot make improvements and their land is essentially frozen. As such, if they were about to sell their farm lot to their neighbour, whom they have known for many years, and suddenly the neighbour says they have zero ability to predict whether they will be able to use the land in the fashion that they planned for their model, this would simply drive the value of that property down. Who would blame that neighbour, and who would blame someone else for wanting to come in?

It is so draconian, what the government is calling for, that they could actually say no to new improvements. While someone is going through this process, they would be given very short notice. They would be told that they could not make improvements to their property, and they would be trying to attempt a sale. I said to the

minister and committee that this is not fair, but the minister simply said this would all be ironed out through that process.

• (1840)

I should even take a step back. We challenged the minister to look at an accelerated CTA review that would not just allow the project to proceed with timeliness but also provide a process whereby communities could formally submit their thoughts. Instead, Alto is running a consultation process, and it is not the same as an independent tribunal, such as the CTA, that can review all the evidence and make a determination as to where the line should go.

Speaking of where the line should go, there are going to be cases where properties will have a crossing, and there will be many properties that will not. As we heard from previous members, for a property owner to suddenly find that the most direct path they have taken for 20 years to get to the hospital will be closed, and that there will be no overpass that will allow them quick access, has a tremendous effect on people who need to make life decisions, such as being close to health care.

It also means routes are going to be slowed down, so an ambulance ride that would take 10 to 15 minutes might take over an hour now. These are things that are going to be decided by Alto, not by a tribunal that hears the evidence and that says what is reasonable given the stated goal of the project and given the community's very valid concerns.

Instead, Bill C-15 would just wipe all of that out. We offered the minister that, and the minister, just like with all these things, gave a tin ear. He would essentially be giving the keys to the castle to Alto and letting those communities fall into the moat. It is simply the worst way to run a procurement.

Are there some reasonable amendments that have been brought up at report stage? I am happy to say that there are. The idea is that if a property owner is frozen and maybe they have a barn or hen house that burns down or a water or flood event happens, they should be able to restore that property.

That is a simple courtesy to the people who are there, but I will also say that I have some tremendous concerns, because we always talk about the front end of expropriation and the frozen process, but there is also the back end. In every single procurement that the federal government goes through, and the Bloc Québécois member for Mirabel reminded us of this in the House, the federal government does not always do as it says it will.

In fact, it can happen that the government will expropriate or freeze someone's land but then never use it, and there is nothing in Bill C-15 that would protect people from these things. We have a process set up by the government that would essentially allow it to play the hero and Alto to play the villain. We have now a situation whereby Alto essentially has been given the run of the road and could literally run over communities, go over traditional roads and infrastructure, and divide communities without even having to say it will fix it and build an overpass. There would be no process for that. Alto would get to decide. There would be no independent tribunal that could be appealed to.

There is that, and again, freezing someone's assets on short notice is totally waiving many of the protections found in the Expropriation Act. When the government says it wants to be exempt from long-standing law so that it can give the insiders of Alto the ultimate authority, I think that the government has overreached. Conservatives will not support that type of process.

Therefore, we will be looking to support reasonable amendments that start to take into account and to pull some of that power back to the property owners, because these property owners are worried. They are concerned, and so far, these consultation processes are consultation in name only. They are not meaningful, and they are not assuring the communities. As the member for Northumberland—Clarke stated previously, information is what gives people certainty. Unfortunately, through this particular bill, Bill C-15, the government has put no onus on Alto to do that.

Again, Conservatives support those affected property owners. We feel that the government has not looked out for their interests, but if the Liberals do not, the Conservatives will.

• (1845)

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we see members of the opposition resorting to fear tactics over high-speed rail.

[English]

We know very well that high-speed rail is a generational project that will bring a lot of very positive economic benefits to all the regions between Quebec and Peterborough, where it is going to be.

[Translation]

The opposition member is well aware that the laws were changed in 1985 to ensure that consultations are held and that social licence is assured. However, opposition members continue to use fearmongering and obstructionist tactics, as they do every day.

If the Conservative member is truly here for his constituents, will he support Bill C-15?

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, what was said about Alto's authority is absolutely false.

[English]

It is anything but absolute. The government holds all the cards. It decides if there should be consultation. There is nothing in here that actually requires the government to do what we originally asked of

Government Orders

the minister, to have an accelerated CTA process whereby communities could be heard and an independent tribunal could come down and weigh in on where the public interest is and where the private interest is, to make it so that it is fair.

For the member to say that is fearmongering, no, that is called making a suggestion. That is called a win-win. Unfortunately, by taking the side of Alto and ultimately all of the authority that has been given—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member to continue questions and comments.

The hon. member for Joliette—Manawan.

• (1850)

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I went to an Alto event last week in Berthierville where the farmers of Lanaudière turned out in force. They are deeply worried.

In my colleague's opinion, what does Bill C-15 require in terms of taking rights away from expropriated individuals? If that was not part of Bill C-15, what would stop the project from moving forward, perhaps with a little more respect for the people it would affect?

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is absolutely important and imperative for Parliament to decide whether the best way to proceed is with Alto and whether Alto is the best regulatory body. It is a company, not a tribunal. Using an independent body such as the Canadian Transportation Agency would give a great deal of certainty to the communities affected and to property owners who are very concerned at this time.

I am grateful to the Bloc Québécois and other members for working to improve this, because the Minister of Transport does not agree with us.

[English]

Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague is the shadow minister for transport. I am just kind of curious. If he had \$90 billion sitting in his pocket, would he be putting it into high-speed rail, or would he be looking at places like the port of Vancouver? Would he be looking at things like a national highway that is actually twinned? Would he be looking at other things like that if he had that kind of money?

If we had been through 10 years of really good economic conditions and Canada could be self-sufficient, we would be in a different boat, but we are not. We are a trading nation, so if my colleague had that kind of money, where would he place it?

Government Orders

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I think we can all ask the question of what we would do with \$1 billion, but I need to take a moment to think about \$90 billion in one project, in one particular area. We could fix up the Trans-Canada Highway. We could establish northern Arctic ports. We could establish much more productive ports that would actually carry out some of the things the government says it is all about, increasing and diversifying our trade. We could spend \$90 billion in a lot of different ways.

I think the House needs to consider where we should be putting our money.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 33.

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

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 34. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 35 to 43.

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

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 47.

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

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 48. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 49 to 54.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party

participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 55. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 56 to 77.

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

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 78. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 79 and 80.

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

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 81. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 82.

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

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

• (1925)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the delay, pursuant to Standing Order 30(7), there will be no Private Members' Business hour today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

• (1930)

[*English*]

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at report stage of Bill C-15.

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 33.

• (1940)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 75*)

YEAS

Members

Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Champoux
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Fortin
Garon	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Idlout	Johns
Kwan	Larouche
Lemire	May
McPherson	Normandin
Perron	Plamondon
Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Ste-Marie	Thériault — 30

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Bardeesy
Barlow	Barrett
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinipi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Bittle
Block	Blois
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Calkins	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chambers
Champagne	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Cobena
Connors	Cooper
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dalton
Dancho	Dandurand
Danko	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder

Government Orders

Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gahey
Gallant	Gasparro
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Grant
Greaves	Groleau
Guay	Guglielmin
Guilbeault	Gull-Masty
Gunn	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardy	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Ho	Hoback
Hodgson	Hogan
Holman	Housefather
Hussen	Iacono
Jackson	Jacek
Jansen	Jeneroux
Jivani	Joly
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Kelly
Khalid	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Klassen	Kmiec
Konanz	Koutrakis
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Lake
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lantsman
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lavack	Lavoie
Lawrence	Lawton
LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Leitão	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Maloney
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCaughey
McGuinty	McKelvie
McKenzie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Calgary Centre)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)	Melillo
Ménard	Mendès
Menegakis	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Moore

Government Orders

Morin	Morrison
Morrissey	Motz
Muys	Myles
Naqvi	Nater
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Ntumba
Oliphant	Olszewski
O'Rourke	Osborne
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre
Powlowski	Provost
Ramsay	Rana
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Richards	Roberts
Robertson	Rocheffort
Romanado	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Royer	Ruff
Sahota	Saini
Sarai	Sari
Sawatzky	Scheer
Schiefke	Schmale
Seeback	Sgro
Sheehan	Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Small	Sodhi
Solomon	Sousa
Steinley	Stevenson
St-Pierre	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Turnbull	Valdez
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandenbeld	Vien
Viersen	Villeneuve
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Watchorn
Waugh	Weiler
Wilkinson	Williamson
Yip	Zahid
Zerucelli	Zimmer
Zuberi — 301	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No.1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 33 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 34. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 35 to 43.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting against.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote against the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 76*)

YEAS

Members

Boulerice	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Gazan	Idlout
Johns	Kwan
McPherson — 7	

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Bardeesy
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Bittle
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Blois
Bonin	Bonk
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brière
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Cobena	Connors
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Dancho
Dandurand	Danko
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Epp	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin

Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gaheer
 Gallant
 Gasparro
 Généreux
 Gerretsen
 Gill (Windsor West)
 Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
 Godin
 Gould
 Grant
 Groleau
 Guglielmin
 Gull-Masty
 Hajdu
 Hanley
 Harrison
 Hirtle
 Hoback
 Hogan
 Housefather
 Iacono
 Jaczek
 Jeneroux
 Joly
 Kayabaga
 Kelly
 Khanna
 Kirkland
 Kmiec
 Koutrakis
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kuruc
 Lake
 Lambropoulos
 Lantsman
 Lapointe (Sudbury)
 Lattanzio
 Lavack
 Lawrence
 LeBlanc
 Leitão
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Long
 Ma
 MacDonald (Cardigan)
 Mahal
 Malette (Bay of Quinte)
 Maloney
 Martel
 McCauley
 McKelvie
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLean (Calgary Centre)
 Melillo
 Mendès
 Michel
 Miller
 Moore
 Morrison
 Motz
 Myles
 Nater
 Nguyen
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 O'Rourke
 Patzer

Fraser
 Fuhr
 Gainey
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Genuis
 Gill (Calgary McKnight)
 Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gourde
 Greaves
 Guay
 Guilbeault
 Gunn
 Hallan
 Hardy
 Hepfner
 Ho
 Hodgson
 Holman
 Hussen
 Jackson
 Jansen
 Jivani
 Joseph
 Kelloway
 Khalid
 Kibble
 Klassen
 Konanz
 Kram
 Kronis
 Kusie
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lavoie
 Lawton
 Lefebvre
 Lemire
 Lewis (Essex)
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Majumdar
 Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
 Mantle
 Mazier
 McGuinty
 McKenzie
 McKnight
 McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
 Ménard
 Menegakis
 Miedema
 Mingarelli
 Morin
 Morrissey
 Muys
 Naqvi
 Nathan
 Noormohamed
 Ntumba
 Olszewski
 Osborne
 Paul-Hus

Perron
 Plamondon
 Powlowski
 Ramsay
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Richards
 Robertson
 Romanado
 Ross
 Royer
 Sahota
 Sarai
 Savard-Tremblay
 Scheer
 Schmale
 Sgro
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Small
 Solomon
 Steinley
 Stevenson
 Strahl
 Stubbs
 Tesser Derksen
 Thomas
 Tochor
 Turnbull
 van Koeverden
 Vandenbeld
 Viersen
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Waugh
 Wilkinson
 Yip
 Zerucelli
 Zuberi— 323

Government Orders

Petitpas Taylor
 Poilievre
 Provost
 Rana
 Reid
 Reynolds
 Roberts
 Rochefort
 Rood
 Rowe
 Ruff
 Saini
 Sari
 Sawatzky
 Schiefke
 Seebach
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Sodhi
 Sousa
 Ste-Marie
 St-Pierre
 Strauss
 Sudds
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Tolmie
 Valdez
 Van Popta
 Vien
 Villeneuve
 Wagantall
 Watchorn
 Weiler
 Williamson
 Zahid
 Zimmer

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 34 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 35 to 43 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 47.

● (1955)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 77*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bonin

Government Orders

Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 176

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 45 to 47 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 48. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 49 to 54.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting against.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 48, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 78*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Bexte
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Boulerice
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Chambers
Cobena
Dalton
Davidson

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Champoux
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)

Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fortin
Garon
Gazan
Genius
Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jackson
Jivani
Kelly
Kibble
Kmiec
Kram
Kronis
Kusie
Lake
Larouche
Lawton
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Mahal
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shipley
Small
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Stubbs
Thomas
Tolmie
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

DeBellefeuille
DeRidder
Diotte
Gowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gladu
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Idlout
Jansen
Johns
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kuruc
Kwan
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Majumdar
Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
McPherson
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Perron
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Simard
Steinley
Stevenson
Strauss
Thériault
Tochor
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer — 162

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Bains
Bardeesy

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Baker
Battiste

Government Orders

Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Bendayan	Bittle	Thompson	Turnbull
Blois	Brière	Valdez	van Koeverden
Carney	Carr	Vandenbeld	Villeneuve
Casey	Chagger	Watchorn	Weiler
Champagne	Chang	Wilkinson	Yip
Chartrand	Chatel	Zahid	Zerucelli
Chen	Chenette	Zuberi— 169	
Chi	Church		
Clark	Connors		PAIRED
Cormier	Coteau		
Dabrusin	Dandurand	Nil	
Danko	d'Entremont		
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers	The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 48 defeated. I therefore de- clare Motions Nos. 49 to 54 defeated.	
Dhalliwal	Dhillon	Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. My eyesight is giving me some difficulties. For the last motion, I would like to vote in favour.	
Diab	Duclos	The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent for the member to change her vote?	
Duguid	Dzerowicz	Some hon. members: No.	
Earle	Ehsassi	[<i>Translation</i>]	
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith	The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 55. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 56 to 77.	
Eyolfson	Fancy	• (2000)	
Fanjoy	Fergus	[<i>English</i>]	
Fisher	Fonseca	Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote with Liberals voting against.	
Fortier	Fragiskatos	Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives also voting against.	
Fraser	Fry	[<i>Translation</i>]	
Fuhr	Gaheer	Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.	
Gainey	Gasparro	Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.	
Gerretsen	Gould	Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.	
Grant	Greaves	[<i>English</i>]	
Guay	Guilbeault	(The House divided on Motion No. 55, which was negated on the following division:)	
Gull-Masty	Hajdu	(<i>Division No. 79</i>)	
Hanley	Harrison	YEAS	
Hepfner	Hirtle	Members	
Hodgson	Hogan	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Housefather	Hussen	Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Iacono	Jaczek	Bonin	Brunelle-Duceppe
Jeneroux	Joly	Champoux	DeBellefeuille
Joseph	Kayabaga	Deschênes	Fortin
Kelloway	Khalid	Garon	Gaudreau
Klassen	Koutrakis	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi- nan)	Larouche
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Lemire	Normandin
Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Perron	Plamondon
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lattanzio	Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Lauzon	Lavack	Ste-Marie	Thériault— 22
Lavoie	LeBlanc		
Leitão	Lightbound		
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)		
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)		
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney		
May	McGuinty		
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)		
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)		
Ménard	Mendès		
Michel	Miedema		
Miller	Mingarelli		
Morrissey	Myles		
Naqvi	Nathan		
Nguyen	Noormohamed		
Ntumba	Oliphant		
Olszewski	O'Rourke		
Osborne	Petitpas Taylor		
Powlowski	Provost		
Ramsay	Rana		
Robertson	Rocheffort		
Romanado	Royer		
Sahota	Saini		
Sarai	Sari		
Sawatzky	Schiefke		
Sgro	Sheehan		
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)		
Sodhi	Solomon		
Sousa	St-Pierre		

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Acan	Iacono	Idlout
Aitchison	Al Soud	Jackson	Jaczek
Albas	Ali	Jansen	Jeneroux
Allison	Alty	Jivani	Johns
Anand	Anandasangaree	Joly	Joseph
Anderson	Anstey	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Arnold	Au	Kelly	Khalid
Baber	Bailey	Khanna	Kibble
Bains	Baker	Kirkland	Klassen
Baldinelli	Bardeesy	Kmiec	Konanz
Barlow	Barrett	Koutrakis	Kram
Battiste	Beech	Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinipi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan	Kuruc	Kusie
Berthold	Bexte	Kwan	Lake
Bezan	Bittle	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Block	Blois	Lamoureux	Lantsman
Bonk	Borrelli	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Boulerice	Bragdon	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Brassard	Brière	Lavack	Lavoie
Brock	Calkins	Lawrence	Lawton
Carney	Carr	LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Casey	Chagger	Leitão	Leslie
Chambers	Champagne	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Chang	Chartrand	Lightbound	Lloyd
Chatel	Chen	Lobb	Long
Chenette	Chi	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma
Church	Clark	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Cobena	Connors	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Mahal
Cooper	Cormier	Majumdar	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Coteau	Dabrusin	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins— Mushkegowuk)	Maloney
Dalton	Dancho	Mantle	Martel
Dandurand	Danko	May	Mazier
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	McCauley	McGuinty
Davies (Niagara South)	Deltell	McKelvie	McKenzie
d'Entremont	DeRidder	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers	McLean (Calgary Centre)	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	McPherson	Melillo
Diab	Diotte	Ménard	Mendès
Doherty	Dowdall	Menegakis	Michel
Duclos	Duguid	Miedema	Miller
Duncan	Dzerowicz	Mingarelli	Moore
Earle	Ehsassi	Morin	Morrison
El-Khoury	Epp	Morrissey	Motz
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Muys	Myles
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)	Naqvi	Nater
Fancy	Fanjoy	Nathan	Nguyen
Fergus	Fisher	Noormohamed	Ntumba
Fonseca	Fortier	Oliphant	Olszewski
Fragiskatos	Fraser	O'Rourke	Osborne
Fry	Fuhr	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Gaheer	Gainey	Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre
Gallant	Gasparro	Powlowski	Provost
Gazan	Généreux	Ramsay	Rana
Genuis	Gerretsen	Redekopp	Reid
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)	Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu	Richards	Roberts
Godin	Goodridge	Robertson	Rochefort
Gould	Gourde	Romanado	Rood
Grant	Greaves	Ross	Rowe
Groleau	Guay	Royer	Ruff
Guglielmin	Guilbeault	Sahota	Saini
Gull-Masty	Gunn	Sarai	Sari
Hajdu	Hallan	Sawatzky	Scheer
Hanley	Hardy	Schiefke	Schmale
Harrison	Hepfner	Seeback	Sgro
Hirtle	Ho	Sheehan	Shipley
Hoback	Hodgson	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Hogan	Holman	Small	Sodhi
Housefather	Hussen	Solomon	Sousa
		Steinley	Stevenson
		St-Pierre	Strahl
		Strauss	Stubbs

Government Orders

Sudds
Thomas
Tochor
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Vis
Warkentin
Waugh
Wilkinson
Yip
Zerucelli
Zuberi — 309

Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Tolmie
Valdez
Van Popta
Vien
Villeneuve
Wagantall
Watchorn
Weiler
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille
DeRidder
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)

Dalton
Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fortin
Garon
Gazan
Genuis
Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 55 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 56 to 77 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 78. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 79 and 80.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this vote, with Liberals voting no.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yes, with the exception of the member for Newmarket—Aurora, who will be abstaining during this vote.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to applying the vote, voting yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 80*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Bexte
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Boulerice
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Chambers

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Champoux

Gladu
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Idlout
Jansen
Johns
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kuruc
Kwan
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Majumdar

Mantle
May
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shipley
Small
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Stubbs
Thomas
Tolmie
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jackson
Jivani
Kelly
Kibble
Kmiec
Kram
Kronis
Kusie
Lake
Larouche
Lawton
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Mahal
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
Mazier
McKenzie
McPherson
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Perron
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Simard
Steinley
Stevenson
Strauss
Thériault
Tochor
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer — 162

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree

Bains
 Bardeesy
 Beech
 Bendayan
 Blois
 Carney
 Casey
 Champagne
 Chartrand
 Chen
 Chi
 Clark
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Danko
 Deschênes-Thériault
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Duguid
 Earle
 El-Khoury
 Eyolfson
 Fanjoy
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser
 Fuhr
 Gainey
 Gerretsen
 Grant
 Guay
 Gull-Masty
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Hodgson
 Housefather
 Iacono
 Jeneroux
 Joseph
 Kelloway
 Klassen
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lapointe (Sudbury)
 Lauzon
 Lavoie
 Leitão
 Long
 Ma
 MacDonald (Cardigan)
 Malette (Bay of Quinte)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
 Mendès
 Miedema
 Mingarelli
 Myles
 Nathan
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 O'Rourke
 Petitpas Taylor
 Provost
 Rana
 Rochefort
 Royer
 Saini
 Sari
 Schiefke
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)

Baker
 Battiste
 Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)
 Bittle
 Brière
 Carr
 Chagger
 Chang
 Chatel
 Chenette
 Church
 Connors
 Coteau
 Dandurand
 d'Entremont
 Desrochers
 Dhillon
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fancy
 Ferguson
 Fonseca
 Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gaheer
 Gasparro
 Gould
 Greaves
 Guilbeault
 Hajdu
 Harrison
 Hirtle
 Hogan
 Hussien
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
 Lattanzio
 Lavack
 LeBlanc
 Lightbound
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Maloney
 McKelvie
 McKnight
 Ménard
 Michel
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Nguyen
 Ntumba
 Olszewski
 Osborne
 Powlowski
 Ramsay
 Robertson
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Sarai
 Sawatzky
 Sgro
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Sodhi

Solomon
 St-Pierre
 Tesser Derksen
 Turnbull
 van Koeverden
 Villeneuve
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zerucelli

Sousa
 Sudds
 Thompson
 Valdez
 Vandenbeld
 Watchorn
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 168

Government Orders

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 78 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 79 and 80 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 81.

A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 82.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the votes from the previous one to this one, with Liberals voting against.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against, including the member for Newmarket—Aurora.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 81, which was negated to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 81*)

YEAS

Members

Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Champoux
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Fortin
Garon	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawachikamach—Nitassinan)
	Johns
Idlout	Larouche
Kwan	May
Lemire	Normandin
McPherson	Plamondon
Perron	Simard
Savard-Tremblay	Thériault— 30
Ste-Marie	

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud

Government Orders

Albas	Ali	Kibble	Kirkland
Allison	Alty	Klassen	Kmiec
Anand	Anandasangaree	Konanz	Koutrakis
Anderson	Anstey	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Arnold	Au	Kronis	Kuruc
Baber	Bailey	Kusie	Lake
Bains	Baker	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Baldinelli	Bardeesy	Lamoureux	Lantsman
Barlow	Barrett	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Battiste	Beech	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan	Lavack	Lavoie
Berthold	Bexte	Lawrence	Lawton
Bezan	Bittle	LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Block	Blois	Leitão	Leslie
Bonk	Borrelli	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Bragdon	Brassard	Lightbound	Lloyd
Brière	Brock	Lobb	Long
Calkins	Carney	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma
Carr	Casey	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Chagger	Chambers	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Mahal
Champagne	Chang	Majumdar	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Chartrand	Chatel	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins— Mushkegowuk)	Maloney
Chen	Chenette	Mantle	Martel
Chi	Church	Mazier	McCauley
Clark	Cobena	McGuinty	McKelvie
Connors	Cooper	McKenzie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Cormier	Coteau	McKnight	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Dabrusin	Dalton	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)	Melillo
Dancho	Dandurand	Ménard	Mendès
Danko	Davidson	Menegakis	Michel
Davies (Niagara South)	Deltell	Miedema	Miller
d'Entremont	DeRidder	Mingarelli	Moore
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers	Morin	Morrison
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Morrissey	Motz
Diab	Diotte	Muys	Myles
Doherty	Dowdall	Naqvi	Nater
Duclos	Duguid	Nathan	Nguyen
Duncan	Dzerowicz	Noormohamed	Ntumba
Earle	Ehsassi	Oliphant	Olszewski
El-Khoury	Epp	O'Rourke	Osborne
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)	Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre
Fancy	Fanjoy	Powlowski	Provost
Fergus	Fisher	Ramsay	Rana
Fonseca	Fortier	Redekopp	Reid
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Fry	Fuhr	Richards	Roberts
Gaheer	Gainey	Robertson	Rochefort
Gallant	Gasparro	Romanado	Rood
Généreux	Genuis	Ross	Rowe
Gerretsen	Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Royer	Ruff
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Sahota	Saini
Gladu	Godin	Sarai	Sari
Goodridge	Gould	Sawatzky	Scheer
Gourde	Grant	Schiefke	Schmale
Greaves	Groleau	Seeback	Sgro
Guay	Guglielmin	Sheehan	Shipley
Guilbeault	Gull-Masty	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Gunn	Hajdu	Small	Sodhi
Hallan	Hanley	Solomon	Sousa
Hardy	Harrison	Steinley	Stevenson
Hepfner	Hirtle	St-Pierre	Strahl
Ho	Hoback	Strauss	Stubbs
Hodgson	Hogan	Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Holman	Housefather	Thomas	Thompson
Hussen	Iacono	Tochor	Tolmie
Jackson	Jaczek	Turnbull	Valdez
Jansen	Jeneroux	van Koevorden	Van Popta
Jivani	Joly	Vandenbeld	Vien
Joseph	Kayabaga	Viersen	Villeneuve
Kelloway	Kelly	Vis	Wagantall
Khalid	Khanna	Warkentin	Watchorn

Waugh
Wilkinson
Yip
Zerucelli
Zuberi— 301

Weiler
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 81 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 82 defeated.

• (2005)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in at report stage.

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

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe, if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this one, with Liberals voting yes

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote. We will be voting no.

(The House divided on the motion, which was carried on the following division:)

(*Division No. 82*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Battiste
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)
Bendayan	Bittle
Blois	Brière
Carney	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz

Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fuhr
Gainey
Gerretsen
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jeneroux
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheport
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schiefke
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Government Orders

Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gaheer
Gasparro
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Jaczek
Joly
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
Olshewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatcky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 168

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval

Adjournment Proceedings

Beaulieu	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bonin
Bonk	Borrelli
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Chambers	Champoux
Cobena	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Niagara South)	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	DeRidder
Deschênes	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Gaudreau
Gazan	Généreux
Geniis	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Idlout
Jackson	Jansen
Jivani	Johns
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lantsman
Larouche	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	May
Mazier	McCauley
McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
McPherson	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perron	Plamondon
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shiple
Simard	Small
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thériault	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Van Popta	Vien

Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Williamson
Zimmer—163	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to go to Adjournment Proceedings.**The Speaker:** Is it agreed?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

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

[English]

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on October 2, the health minister's senior official told the health committee that no federal funds were used to buy crack pipes. On December 9, the same official corrected her testimony and revealed that federal funding can in fact be used to buy crack pipes. Then, on December 11, the health minister herself stated in the House that the government does not fund the purchase of crack pipes.

Both statements cannot be true, so can Health Canada funding be used to purchase crack pipes? I ask for a simple yes or no.

• (2010)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member opposite that issues related to drugs are ones the government takes very seriously. In fact, as a government, whether it is on the issue of crack pipes or of safe injection sites, which is what I was expecting the member to raise and talk about this evening, we continue to work with other levels of government. In working in co-operation with other levels of government, at the end of the day we want to be able to achieve what is healthy for the community.

There might be instances that occur, and if the member has a specific file or case he is concerned about, I would recommend he bring it to the attention of the ministry, possibly to the deputy minister or the minister directly.

I cannot give you a clear yes or no on that particular issue, for the simple reason that I had no indication you were going to be asking about crack pipes—

The Speaker: The hon. member, who is very experienced, knows that he must go through the Chair.**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry.

Adjournment Proceedings

At the end of the day, what I want to do is indicate that the Department of Health works with many different stakeholders, and the purpose of doing that is to ensure that the policy set out by Health Canada is in fact in the best interest of the community and of the individuals who have drug-related issues.

If there is something specific, like what the member just raised in regard to crack pipes, I would suggest that he might want to bring it directly to the attention of the Minister of Health. This is the first I have heard of it, because the question I was provided with did not, I think, make any reference to it whatsoever.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, if the member would like, I could read the question:

... yesterday Health Canada officials revealed at committee that there are no age requirements at federally approved drug injection sites. In fact, Health Canada revealed that there is not even a requirement for ID. That means minors can legally use drugs in these consumption sites under Liberal law. The health minister approves supervised drug injection sites through the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

Why are the Liberals allowing minors to inject hard drugs under their watch?

This is the actual question the member put forward, so that is what I am responding to. I am trying to be as courteous as I can in trying to indicate to the member opposite that with respect to drug injection sites, there is a process that needs to be followed, and it involves a considerable amount of consultation by the different levels of government and the different stakeholders, which is what we have seen.

I would really encourage the member, if he wants to pursue the issue of crack pipes, to bring it up directly with the ministry and possibly the minister. I was not prepared for that specific question, and that is the reason I am taking more of a general approach.

Dan Mazier: Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the member did not answer my question. I guess he was unprepared for the question on crack pipes, on which we have a conflict of opinion.

However, he did bring up another important issue. Why are the Liberals allowing minors to approach and use drugs at consumption sites?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have learned over the years of being a parliamentarian is that out in our communities we have all sorts of experts, people who truly understand the issues and complexities of drug-related issues. What we have witnessed is a great deal of co-operation from the different levels of government and first responders. By doing that, the government works in co-operation with them and, ultimately, there is a consensus brought forward dealing with the manner in which drug consumption sites or safe sites are administered.

FINANCE

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hopefully the parliamentary secretary does a better job with this question than the last one. It is interesting that he is here again today to pad his word count. I noticed that the challenge he had just now was that he was answering questions the Liberals knew were coming from the shadow minister for health. Rather than have the parliamentary secretary for health answer the questions, as would normally be the case, I do not know why they would have this par-

liamentary secretary answer. I do not know why he is here to answer my questions today as well.

The question I asked back in November came after the budget. At that point in time, Fitch Ratings came out raising an alarm. It said, in a release it put out, that “Canada’s...proposed budget, announced in Parliament on Nov. 4, underscores the erosion of the federal government’s finances”. It went on to say, “persistent fiscal expansion and a rising debt burden have weakened its credit profile and could increase rating pressure over the medium term.”

At that point in time, I raised the issue of the previous long-standing Liberal government, the government that was in place from 1993 until we finally got relief in January of 2006, just over 20 years ago. Of course, that government was dealing with the impacts of another previous Trudeau government that ran 14 deficits in 15 years. A generation later, the Chrétien-Martin government had to deal with the effects of all of those deficits and the debt that had risen. By the way, the debt that had been added was so high that the subsequent Mulroney government, who the Liberals at that time liked to say ran the biggest deficits in Canadian history, deficits that were entirely interest on Trudeau debt, was forced to cut 32% from the transfers for health, social services and education. I think it was called the Canada social transfer.

I raised the fact that at that point in time, those cuts were precipitated by a ratings cut. Fitch has announced that it is concerned about Canada's fiscal situation. I asked if anyone over there understood the situation. At that point, instead of the finance minister standing, the Minister of Energy stood up, and I am sure this is very reassuring for all Canadians. He said, “We are doing just fine.” That was the reassurance we got.

Therefore, I asked a second question that day and walked through some quotes from the early nineties from Reuters. From February 1994, it says, “Liberal government brings down what it considers to be a tough budget.... It nonetheless still has spending rising slightly, and immediate public and market reaction is it did not go nearly far enough.” In January 1995, this was a headline: “A biting editorial in the Wall Street Journal headlined 'Bankrupt Canada' calls Canada 'an honorary member of the Third World'”.

I have been raising this alarm and I think Canadians should be concerned, because the government has added another \$16 billion in debt since the promise made at election time, and since the budget it has added billions more in spending that is not accounted for. I am curious how we have gone, in just a decade, from a country with a balanced budget and the richest middle class in the world to a country that has to borrow from our kids to subsidize groceries for an entire generation.

Adjournment Proceedings

● (2015)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, if I may, the member seemed to be a little upset with the fact that I might have some knowledge in regard to the issue of health care. Having worked with health care workers for many years in the province of Manitoba, having been the health care critic and having visited drug sites, I do have a bit of a sense of the issue that is being raised.

The member opposite brought up an issue that was not going to be raised, and it was a specific question. At times, yes, it is better not to provide a concise answer to a question until one actually knows what one is talking about. I suspect that even the member opposite would have to concede that it is, in fact, the case.

On the issue the member raised, I have a very good sense of what needs to be said here, which is that the Conservative Party continues to go around talking about how Canada is broken. That is just not the case. If the member was to check with his constituents, he would find that Canada is the best place in the world to call home.

When the member talks about the deficit, seriously, the Harper government, which his leader was a part of, inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus back when they took over the reins of power. By the time that ended, they actually had nothing but deficits throughout that period of time, and they had to sell GM shares in order to falsify and make it look as if they had balanced the budget.

Today, we have the strongest and healthiest credit rating possible, which is a AAA rating. As a government, we have a Prime Minister who has economic experience and has dealt with being the Governor of the Bank of Canada and the Governor of the Bank of England. He has impeccable credentials in dealing with the economy, and we have decided to build a stronger, healthier economy by investing in Canadians as opposed to ignoring Canadians and doing nothing but rage mongering and trying to give a false impression that Canada is all doom and gloom.

We have good reason to be optimistic, because we have a Prime Minister, a cabinet and a Liberal caucus that truly understand the value Canada has to offer the world. That is one of the reasons we have ministers and a Prime Minister who are going around attracting billions of dollars in foreign investment to our country. It is the reason we are increasing trade opportunities around the world while at the same time working on making sure that we get a good trade agreement with the United States of America. We can contrast that to the Conservative Party, which talks about misery and spreads misinformation constantly, whether it is on the floor of the House of Commons or through social media.

I do not need to take a lesson from the member opposite on what the Conservative Party might be able to do in some sort of dreamland. I know full well that when we talk about the policies they espouse, we will find that, at the end of day, they do not make any sense, and that demonstrates that they do not care about the interests of Canadians.

There have been a number of opposition days, and if we look at those we will find that what the Conservatives constantly want to talk about is rage and getting Canadians upset. A good example of

that was yesterday, when they took the issue of asylum seekers and meshed it in with the issue of health care, which is an issue that Canadians are truly concerned about. They tied them together in order to portray an impression that immigration is bad for Canada, when in fact immigrants have built Canada to what it is today. In one sense, we are all immigrants.

I would just give that as a piece of advice to the member opposite.

● (2020)

Hon. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that there was not even an attempt to answer my question.

To put it in context, if we want to contrast, in 2008 we faced a global economic crisis, and our government at the time put in place a plan to spend money to get through the crisis, but with a plan to get back to a balanced budget by 2015, which we did. We had the richest middle class in the world, according to *The New York Times* at that point in time.

We can contrast that with his government's approach, which faced a global crisis and has run increasing deficits. In fact, in the election campaign just 10 months ago, the Liberals promised in their platform that they would run an astounding \$62-billion deficit. That deficit grew to \$78 billion in the fall, and then they announced a \$12-billion plan to subsidize food, groceries, for a quarter of Canadians. How in the world did we get there?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the member talks about 2008. As we remember, Stephen Harper inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus. He turned it into a multi-billion dollar deficit before 2008. When 2008 came around, it was the banking industry in Canada, in good part, that saved the day compared with what was taking place in the United States and other areas of the world. One of the reasons Canada got credit was the regulations we had in banking.

The member said the Conservatives had a surplus in 2015. Well, they might have said they were going to have a surplus, but they never delivered on a surplus because they were kicked out of office before they could actually deliver that final budget.

An hon. member: That's not true.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that is the reality. That is the truth, and you cannot change history, as much as you would like to be able to. The government takes the issue of affordability and inflation—

● (2025)

The Speaker: I am not trying to change history at all.

The hon. member for York—Durham not being present to raise during Adjournment Proceedings the matter for which notice had been given, the notice is deemed withdrawn.

Adjournment Proceedings

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

(The House adjourned at 8:25 p.m.)

Employment	
Sheehan	6002
Hajdu	6002
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Redekopp	6002
Anandasangaree	6003
Redekopp	6003
Anandasangaree	6003
Mazier	6003
Michel	6003
Mazier	6003
Michel	6003
Davies (Niagara South)	6003
Fraser	6003
The Economy	
Lake	6004
Fragiskatos	6004
Lake	6004
Fragiskatos	6004
Cobena	6004
van Koeverden	6004
Cobena	6004
van Koeverden	6005
Industry	
Fancy	6005
Fuhr	6005
Housing	
Ho	6005
Robertson	6005
Ho	6005
Robertson	6005
Mantle	6006
Long	6006
Families, Children and Social Development	
Ntumba	6006
Gainey	6006
Justice	
Brock	6006
Sahota	6006
Indigenous Affairs	
Gazan	6006
Valdez	6006
150th Anniversary of Library of Parliament	
The Speaker	6007

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Interim Federal Health Program	
Motion	6007
Motion negatived	6008

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Clean Coasts Act	
Bill C-244. Second reading	6009
Motion agreed to	6010
(Bill read a second time and referred to a committee)	6010

Fisheries Act	
Bill C-237. Second reading	6010
Motion negatived	6011

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities	
Morrissey	6012

Business of the House	
MacKinnon	6012
Motion	6012
(Motion agreed to)	6012

Petitions	
Arms Exports	
Kwan	6012

Religious Freedom	
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	6012

Recreational Salmon Fishery	
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	6013

B.C. Salmon Fishing Industry	
Kibble	6013

Climate Action	
May	6013

Medical Assistance in Dying	
Wagantall	6013

Religious Freedom	
Wagantall	6013

Government Priorities	
Johns	6013

Questions on the Order Paper	
Lamoureux	6014

Motions for Papers	
Lamoureux	6014

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Report stage	6014
Speaker's Ruling	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater)	6014
Motions in Amendment	
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	6014

Motions Nos. 1 to 43	6014
Garon	6015
Motions Nos. 44 to 47	6015
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	6015
Motions Nos. 48 to 54	6015
Perron	6015
Motions Nos. 55 to 77	6015
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	6016
Motions Nos. 78 to 82	6016
Lamoureux	6017
Ste-Marie	6017
Mantle	6018
Garon	6018
Desrochers	6020
Ste-Marie	6020
Kelly	6020
Perron	6020
Desrochers	6022
Konanz	6022
Larouche	6023
Cobena	6023
Danko	6024
DeBellefeuille	6024
Guglielmin	6025
Barrett	6025
Danko	6026
Ste-Marie	6026
Kramp-Neuman	6026
Richards	6027
Lamoureux	6028
Larouche	6028
Kelly	6029
Hallan	6029
Danko	6030
Ste-Marie	6030
Hoback	6031
May	6031
Lamoureux	6032

Lawrence	6033
DeBellefeuille	6033
Lawrence	6033
Danko	6035
Larouche	6035
Kramp-Neuman	6035
Albas	6035
Desrochers	6037
Ste-Marie	6037
Hoback	6037
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 34 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 44 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 48 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 55 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 78 deferred	6038
Division on Motion No. 81 deferred	6038
Motions Nos. 1 to 33 negated	6040
Motions Nos. 34 to 43 negated	6041
Motions Nos. 44 to 47 negated	6043
Motions Nos. 48 to 54 negated	6044
Motions Nos. 55 to 77 negated	6046
Motions Nos. 78 to 80 negated	6047
Motions Nos. 81 and 82 negated	6049
Champagne	6049
Motion for concurrence	6049
Motion agreed to	6050

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Mental Health and Addictions

Mazier	6050
Lamoureux	6050

Finance

Lake	6051
Lamoureux	6052

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>