



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 342
Tuesday, September 24, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, September 24, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*English*]

AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 94(2) of the Access to Information Act and subsection 72(2) of the Privacy Act, the reports of the Auditor General of Canada on the administration of these acts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), these reports are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 16th report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs in relation to the motion adopted on Monday, September 16, regarding the passing of Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs Grand Chief Cathy Merrick.

* * *

PETITIONS

LEBANON

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of Lebanese Canadians and friends of Lebanon.

Lebanon is living in difficult times socially, politically and economically. The petitioners note that Lebanon has the largest number of refugees per capita in the world, and with the escalation of war,

Lebanon and the Lebanese people are at risk of losing their lives, livelihoods, sovereignty and independence.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to do as it did in 1956 and be a leader in establishing an international force to stabilize Lebanon and the region, to act as a peacemaker and to help address the displacement of people in the region.

[*Translation*]

They believe there is a diplomatic path to resolving the challenges the country is facing.

[*English*]

I am happy to present this petition to the House.

PAKISTAN

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the petitioners have given me a petition to present to the House today. Pakistani Canadians are concerned about the political turmoil in Pakistan following the unjust removal of a democratically elected government and subsequent arrest of Imran Khan.

The petitioners call upon the Canadian government, which promotes fair and free elections around the world, to take steps and measures such as implementing sanctions on corrupt military officials and banning those who have been involved with human rights violations from travelling to Canada; leveraging influence with the IMF to tie new and existing loans to Pakistan on the condition that fair and free elections are held; and requiring these measures to be continued until free and fair elections are held later this year, with the participation of all opposition political parties and leaders.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I received petition e-4753, which has 950 signatures from residents of Edmonton Manning and across the country.

The undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Prime Minister to stop meddling with education, for which provincial governments have the exclusive responsibility under the Canadian Constitution, and apologize for characterizing parental rights as “far right”.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Business of Supply

Some hon. members: Agreed.

help of the Bloc Québécois, went after hunters while letting criminals and gun smugglers go free.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CONFIDENCE IN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE GOVERNMENT

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC) moved:

That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Canada made us all a promise. That promise was that anyone from anywhere could do anything. My parents taught me that. They are teachers, after all. They taught me a lot of things. I was adopted by these two teachers because I was born to a 16-year-old single mom who could not raise me at that time. My parents taught me that despite my humble beginnings, I could get where I wanted if I was willing to work hard. The promise was kept by our country.

Canada made that same promise to my wife when she came here as a refugee from Venezuela when she was a little girl. All six members of her family lived in a cramped two-bedroom basement apartment in east Montreal. Her dad would get up early in the morning to pick fruit. Later on, he would get up at four in the morning to work in the banking sector. Today, we can safely say that the family has succeeded. My wife Anaida has one brother who is a soldier and another who is a carpenter. Her sister is a nurse. The promise of Canada was kept for her family.

That is why I got into politics in the first place. When I was elected, I was part of a government that expanded that promise by lowering inflation, the GST, income taxes and taxes on small businesses. We also balanced the budget, and we did it all while increasing health transfers faster than any government in the history of health transfers. Personal incomes went up 10% after we lowered inflation and income taxes. We made the promise even more achievable.

Now, however, after nine years of this Prime Minister, the promise of Canada has been broken. He has broken a lot of promises. He promised to balance the budget, to reduce taxes on the middle class, and to build more affordable housing, but all of those promises were broken.

What is different about this promise I am talking about is that it was not the Prime Minister who made it. It does not come from him. This is a promise made to every Canadian, whether they were born here or immigrated to Canada.

It makes us so sad these days to see hard-working young Canadians who are 35 and living in their parents' basements. This never used to happen before this Prime Minister came along with his policies that doubled housing costs. Every month, 2,000 people line up at food banks. There are 1,800 homeless encampments across Ontario. This has never been seen before. This is the type of thing we see in third-world countries. People are dying in these encampments. Gun violence is up 120% since this Prime Minister, with the

We need to talk about what the Bloc Québécois is doing. The Bloc Québécois is helping the current government. It voted 188 times to keep the Prime Minister in power and supported \$500 billion in inflationary, bureaucratic and centralizing spending. I would add that money for health care and seniors was not part of that \$500 billion, not part of that spending, because it is already set out in legislation. There was no need to vote to keep it. What I am talking about is spending on consultants, bureaucrats, interest groups, and big government-subsidized corporations.

• (1010)

At the same time, the Bloc Québécois is voting to increase the fuel tax, including in Quebec with carbon tax 2, which does apply in Quebec, and the capital gains tax, which will force Quebec farmers, entrepreneurs, doctors and home builders to pay Ottawa more money that will be controlled by the federal government. Even the Bloc Québécois's current demands will result in an expansion of the federal government.

It is true that I was part of a government that increased health transfers, but I am not a separatist. The Bloc Québécois says that, in order to fund health care, we need to send more of Quebecers' money to Ottawa, which will send it back to Quebec. The Bloc wants the federal government to have even more control over Quebecers' health. At the same time, it recognizes that Quebecers need the federal programs, which goes against its goal of creating a sovereign state. There is an internal contradiction within the Bloc Québécois.

Now, the Bloc Québécois wants to keep the most centralizing and costly Prime Minister in history in power, a Prime Minister whose immigration policy is out of control, according to his own Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship. That policy has pushed Quebec to the breaking point. The Bloc Québécois says to wait, but waiting never changes anything. The Bloc Québécois is telling Quebecers to wait, when Quebecers cannot get health care or social services or buy a house, when Quebecers see an economy in which the GDP per capita is lower than it was 10 years ago.

Business of Supply

The Bloc Québécois says that it does not know what I am going to do. My immigration policy is very clear. Everyone has seen it. I was a member of the party in power, and we will adopt exactly the same approach to immigration as we did 10 years ago. We gave the provinces a lot of power but maintained control of the numbers. We allowed people to come to Canada and meet our labour needs in sectors experiencing shortages, but in numbers that our labour market, housing market and health care system could handle. That is the approach I adopted when our party was in power, and that is the approach I will adopt in the future. I have already explained my policy in a lot more detail than the other opposition leaders. The leader of the Bloc Québécois has said nothing about most of the major issues. I will be even clearer on the campaign trail, when I will outline my common-sense plan to axe the tax, fix the budget, build the homes and stop the crime.

We will axe the tax to make work pay off again, so that servers, truck drivers and plumbers who work more earn more and bring home powerful paycheques. For that to happen, though, people need a roof over their heads. Currently, Canada has fewer homes per capita than any other G7 country. There is too much red tape. I am going to incentivize municipalities to speed up building permits, cut building taxes and free up land for building, while axing the tax that stands in the way of construction, so that young people still have a chance of getting a home. We will cap population growth so that the housing stock grows faster than the population.

We will fix the budget with a law that requires the government to find one dollar of savings for every new dollar of spending. This is how single moms, seniors and small businesses balance their budgets, and they expect us to adopt the same common-sense approach. We will cut the use of consultants, something the Bloc voted to fund. We will cut bureaucracy, waste and big handouts to multinational corporations that are offshoring our money. We will cut all that to bring the money home so we can lower deficits, inflation and interest rates and fund our social services. We will stop the crime not by banning hunting rifles, as the Bloc and the Liberals want to do, but by being tough on criminals and strengthening the border.

• (1015)

By doing this, we will bring home a country where hard work earns a more powerful paycheque that buys affordable food, gas and homes in safe communities, where anyone from anywhere can do anything through hard work. That is the promise of Canada, and that is what we will bring home.

[English]

This country made me a promise when I was born. It made the same promise to everyone in this room and across this country. I was born to a 16-year-old single mom who put me up for adoption to two school teachers, who taught me about this promise. The promise was that anyone from anywhere could do anything. That hard work would earn one a powerful paycheque. It would buy one good food and a decent home in a safe neighbourhood.

It is that promise that brought my wife's family here as refugees from Venezuela. There were six people in a two-bedroom, basement, working-class, Montreal apartment. Her dad was up at the crack of dawn to hop in the back of a pickup truck to go out into the

middle of a farm field and pick fruits so he could pay the rent. Today, her brothers are a soldier and a carpenter. Her sister is a nurse. Her father has a business with his wife. They have all succeeded. The promise was kept.

It was that promise that got me into politics in the first place. I was very proud to be part of a government that not only kept the promise, but expanded it with the lowest inflation in almost half a century. Incomes after tax and inflation went up 10%. We cut the GST. We balanced the budget. We did it all while increasing health care transfers faster than any government since that time. That is why I welcome every single time they talk about my experience in government. I would like to do the exact same thing in the future, which is to expand the opportunity, expand the promise of this country.

However, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, that promise has been broken. Everything costs more. Two million people are lined up at food banks because they cannot afford food. This is a record-smashing number. One in 10 Torontonians now go to a food bank every single month. Housing costs have doubled and two-thirds of young people believe they will never be able to afford a home. That has never happened in Canadian history. We see it most tragically on our streets, where there are now 1,800 homeless encampments across Ontario, and there are 35 in quaint, beautiful, once prosperous Halifax. The Prime Minister has admitted in his own press releases that one in four kids are not getting enough food. Linked to this, malnutrition and diseases, which had long ago been eradicated, are making a comeback. We have lost 47,000 people to drug overdoses, more than we lost in the Second World War.

These numbers are stories. They are human lives. When the NDP says that all these people can wait, that we do not need to fix these problems now, but just delay another year and let thousands more die, let thousands more lose their homes and move into dangerous tent encampments, thousands more become addicted to government-funded drugs or get killed by a rampant career criminal who was released once again for the 76th time to unleash chaos in our streets. New Democrats tell those Canadians who are suffering the pain of a brutal economy to wait. It is the worst economy since the Great Depression. The GDP per capita, which is the income per person, is down more than at any time since the Great Depression. In fact, our economy per capita is smaller today than it was 10 years ago. Our income per person has dropped more than any other G7 country since 2019, the year before the pandemic, while the American economy has grown 19%, right next door.

Business of Supply

● (1020)

The gap between our per capita GDP and that of the Americans is now worse than at any time since at least World War II, and according to one Liberal economist, Trevor Tombe, the worst in a century.

We have gone from winning the tug-of-war on capitalism with the Americans, where they were investing \$30 billion to \$100 billion more per year in our economy than we were investing in theirs in the first 14 years of this century, to \$450 billion more Canadian money invested in the States than the reverse in the last nine years. Canadian dollars are building pipelines, mines, business centres, shopping centres and businesses that pay American paycheques. I love America, but I do not want to bring jobs to Americans. I want to bring home those jobs and the Canadian promise to this country.

That is why we have a common-sense plan to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. This will be a carbon tax referendum and a carbon tax election. I know that the media has worked hard to try to avoid me saying the words “carbon tax”, as we saw in the extremely dishonest and fraudulent report from Bell Media-controlled CTV, a company whose bonds have been downgraded to near-junk status as its overpaid CEO empties the books to pay his wealthy friends an unacceptably and unrealistically high dividend. He and his cronies at that company are going after me because they know that I am standing up for the people against the crony capitalists and insiders like them.

On a carbon tax election, here is the existential choice. Do we go to a 61¢-a-litre carbon tax, making ours among the highest taxed fuel in all the world, a tax that would grind our economy to a halt, that would force our truckers to leave for the U.S. where there is no carbon tax, leaving nobody to bring goods to our grocery store, parts to our factories or jobs to our people? It will be a nuclear winter if this happens.

That is why common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax. We will bring home jobs, paycheques, businesses and opportunities with abundant, affordable energy. We will fight climate change and protect our economy with technology, not taxes, by approving large-scale green projects that generate nuclear, hydroelectric, carbon capture and storage, and other sources of affordable, clean Canadian energy that will once again get approved when we repeal the anti-development law, Bill C-69. All of this will generate the revenues so that we can fix the budget.

We will fix the budget by unleashing massive growth through the elimination of bureaucratic barriers and firing gatekeepers so that our projects can get built, setting the goal that all three levels of government should aspire to have the fastest building permits process in the entire OECD.

After nine years of tax increases on entrepreneurs and businesses being called tax cheats, we will pass a bring-it-home tax cut to lower the burden on work, savings and investment so that we bring home powerful paycheques and production to this country with lower, fairer, simpler taxes. We will cap government spending with a dollar-for-dollar law that requires we find one dollar of savings for every new dollar of spending. We will cut bureaucracy, waste and consulting contracts, so that we can get the budget close or,

hopefully, on balance as soon as possible to bring down interest rates, inflation and debt.

Finally, we will unleash the construction of homes by incentivizing municipalities to grant faster permits, to free up land and to cut development taxes so that we can build in safe neighbourhoods, with jail, not bail for repeat violent offenders, to bring home the promise of Canada, of a powerful paycheque that earns affordable food, gas and homes in safe neighbourhoods where anyone, from anywhere, can do anything.

Our vision is to be the biggest and most open land of opportunity the world has ever seen. That is our purpose. Now, let us bring it home.

● (1025)

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what is particularly interesting is the Leader of the Opposition's revisionist history of the time that the Conservatives were in government, but one thing that stood out to me in his remarks is that he said he was going to do the exact same thing as when the Conservatives were in government. What I recall, when the Conservatives were in government, was a country that was ashamed of what we were doing on the world stage, ashamed that we were not fighting climate change and that we were putting forward divisive politics and not bringing people together. That is exactly what I heard from the member opposite today.

To get big projects done, we have to do so in co-operation with indigenous partners. To get big things done, we have to do that with Canadians at the forefront. What we are hearing from the member opposite is that he has no intention of doing things to move Canadians forward.

● (1030)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have heard a lot of voices, and it is funny because when the leader of the official opposition was speaking, nobody was making any noise on either side of the House. Now I am hearing a lot of heckling. I would ask members to please be respectful and offer that reciprocal silence to other individuals when they have the floor.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I know that the Liberals are ashamed of our country and its past. That is why they changed the passport to take out Vimy Ridge, Terry Fox and other historical triumphs of Canadians. However, I am very proud of how we upheld that heritage. We helped defeat the Taliban and ISIS on the world stage, in partnership with Barack Obama I might add.

Business of Supply

Speaking of the Americans, we got a deal on softwood lumber. We got an exemption to “buy America”. We had open and free trade.

Our prime minister was respected in the world. He was not dancing around and being laughed out of India or seen in a drunken stupor in some fancy hotel lobby playing the piano the night before the Queen's funeral. He was proud of this country. I am proud of this country. Canadians are proud of this country. We are going to bring home the country we love.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, I just have one question. We have been back for a week and it has now been three weeks since the government reverted to being a minority government, which is what the people voted for in 2021. It is a minority government again, and Parliament has been back for barely a week.

Why the rush to trigger an election? Is this not the perfect opportunity to negotiate and make progress?

We know that the government members are isolated and tormented. No doubt even their pets are not speaking to them. That is why this would be the perfect time, even for the Conservatives, to get down to serious parliamentary work and set aside scorched-earth politics in favour of making progress. This is what our party is counting on.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the question contained two errors.

The Bloc Québécois has not made any progress. The Bloc Québécois has offered its support to this Prime Minister without getting anything in return. It has not achieved anything at all for Quebec. Progress will be made when a common-sense Conservative government respects Quebec's jurisdictions.

The Bloc does not want a Conservative government because when the Conservatives are in power, there will be peace. When the Conservatives were in power in the Harper years, basically, there was no Bloc Québécois, because we had peace. Quebeckers realized that things were going well in Canada and that they were being left alone, so they did not need the Bloc Québécois.

The Liberals and the Bloc are co-dependent. Quebeckers want to be masters of their own house, and we will allow them to do just that.

[*English*]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Madam Speaker, let us review the member for Carleton's record on cuts to health care. He voted against dental care. He voted against pharmacare. He voted to cut health care, time and time again. Maybe it does not matter to somebody who has had the government pay for his dentist appointments since his early 20s, but those costs matter to families.

Let us see whether he actually answers this simple question. Would the member for Carleton cut the dental care program that has provided real relief to seniors and kids? Yes or no.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I am going to start by correcting the falsehoods.

I encourage the member to find one example where I have not voted to increase health care transfers. When I was in government, we increased health care transfers by 70% because of Stephen Harper's courageous leadership and strong books. The NDP voted against those increases. Now, they propose a pharmacare scheme that would ban union workers from keeping their private pharmacare plans. Unions have fought too hard and too long for their drug plans to have the NDP ban what it calls a “single-payer” system, which necessitates banning any non-government plan.

When I was on the floor of Stelco, the men and women there said they want to keep the plan that they fought for. I told them that I will never allow the NDP to ban their private drug plans and impose an inferior government plan that does not work.

• (1035)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There are individuals who want to participate in the debate, but they do not have the floor. Again, I ask them to please be respectful and allow those members who have the floor to speak without interruption.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington has the floor.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know the member for Carleton spent the summer speaking with dozens of hard-working Canadians on factory floors at manufacturing facilities across the country. What message did he hear from the hard-working people who build this country?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the message I heard was that, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, everything is broken. Life costs more, and work does not pay; housing costs have literally doubled. Crime, chaos, drugs and disorder are common in our streets. However, what most disappointed them, especially the ones who voted NDP, is the way that party abandoned them under their radical new leader.

The NDP leader is not like past NDP members. He does not stand up for workers; he stands up for himself and his own narrow self-interest. He has abandoned working people. He has worked to tax their fuel and their food. He wants to ban their pickup trucks and hunting rifles. He supports policies to shut down their union jobs in resource sectors, and he wants to keep them from having their own private drug plans, which they have fought so hard to achieve.

They reject the radicalism and the sellout of the NDP. They want a common-sense Conservative government that would bring home the Canada we love.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members once again that, when somebody else has the floor, they should please not interrupt; that includes not interrupting me when I have the floor.

The hon. member for Victoria is rising on a point of order.

*Business of Supply***POINTS OF ORDER**

ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition used unparliamentary language. I would ask for an apology—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to hear what the point of order is, and I cannot do that if members are yelling out.

The hon. member for Victoria has the floor.

Ms. Laurel Collins: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition used unparliamentary language. I would ask for an apology and for him to no longer use the word “sellout”.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The corporate sellout leader of the Conservative Party used unparliamentary language, and if this language is not acceptable from me, it should not be acceptable from him.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I may have missed that during the discussions that were being had. I will go back and look at the Hansard to see exactly what was said. If it was directed as a personal attack, then I will be asking the leader of the official opposition to withdraw and apologize. I was focused on some heckling, and I did not quite hear what was said. We will go to Hansard and come back to the House if required.

We have time for one more question. The hon. leader of the government in the House has the floor.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CONFIDENCE IN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE GOVERNMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition likes to point out what he thinks are falsehoods, but it is important that we correct the record—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There are a couple of individuals who are still speaking, and it is very difficult to hear what is being said. Therefore, I would ask the hon. leader of the government in the House to ask her question again, and I would ask members to please be respectful.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, the Conservatives were asking me, unofficially, to withdraw a comment about the member from Stornoway working at Dairy Queen. We do not actually know if he ever did work at Dairy Queen.

• (1040)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): If they are going to raise points of order, I would ask that members indi-

cate which Standing Order they are rising on so that the House can function properly. I also do not need other people to encourage anything in the House.

The hon. leader of the government in the House.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, while the Leader of the Opposition likes to call out what he calls “falsehoods”, I think it is important that we set the record straight. When he talks about health care transfers, those were the 2003 health care accords that were signed by Paul Martin, a Liberal prime minister. Therefore, it seems that the good things that he takes credit for were Liberal policies.

However, since he stands on his record, does he plan to raise the age of retirement from 65 to 67, as he did when he was in government? Does he plan to rip up the child care agreements, which he did when he was in government as well?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, no, and what I also do not plan to do is cut health care the way the Liberals did in the preceding years, prior to Conservatives coming in and rebuilding the public health care system. They slashed health care by \$20 billion. We increased it by 70% to heal the pain and damage. Furthermore, I will bring in a blue seal standard so that our brilliant 20,000 immigrant doctors and 32,000 immigrant nurses can get licensed, get to work and reduce waiting lists.

Finally, I will reject the radical plan for a “single-payer” drug plan, which is right in the law. By definition, that means all private plans must be banned under the Liberal-NDP agenda, which they lay out in their wording in their pharmacare bill. They want to keep Canadians from having a private drug plan with the hope and the promise that, one day, they might get a government plan like the government housing plan, which doubled their housing costs; the school food program, which has not delivered a single meal in two years; or the gun plan, which spent \$67 million without recovering a single gun. These people cannot be trusted to run a lemonade stand, let alone a drug plan. I will protect Canadians' right to have a private drug plan so that they have the medication they need when they go to the drug store.

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, today, we are here to discuss confidence in the government. It is a matter that the Leader of the Opposition has put forward. However, what he said just now was full of things that are simply not true. He stated that he is proud of Canada, but he spent the past 20 minutes talking about all the things that he does not like about Canada and about Canadians. All he does is talk about how this country is broken. It is a shame that he wants to put forward a vision that does not put Canadians at the heart of what our government is doing.

Business of Supply

Today, I am here to talk about the fact that, for the past nine years, the government has put Canadians first. We have always had Canadians at the core of everything we do. That is what we will continue to do throughout this minority parliament and, I hope, in the future. However, I want to start with a story.

This Sunday, I was in my community in Burlington, at the Appleby Line Street Festival. I had a number of constituents come up to me, but one who resonated with me in particular was a young mom in her early 30s. She said she needed to thank me for the national child care plan that we put in place because that plan has made a huge difference in her family's life. Her husband, unfortunately, had lost his job for whatever reason. The fact of the matter was that our putting in that child care has meant that he has been able to go back to school and train, and they have been able to afford their child care.

Stories such as these make a difference in people's lives. What we heard from the Leader of the Opposition just now is that he has every intention of undoing the important work that we did. When we think about the fact that over 100,000 women in Ontario alone rejoined the workforce because of that child care plan, that is something that the Leader of the Opposition wants to undo. The leader of the NDP asked him point-blank if he would cut the dental care plan, a plan that 750,000 Canadian seniors and children have now taken advantage of. He refused to answer.

When the Leader of the Opposition was talking about pharmaceuticals, he was misleading Canadians when he stated that they would not be able to access the high-quality drugs that they need and that there would not be a private plan that they could potentially use. What he neglected to mention is that the initial part of this plan is to make diabetes medication and contraceptives free. One thing we need to ask ourselves is why the Leader of the Opposition is against that. Why is he against making contraceptives free for Canadian women?

We know that many members in the party opposite are opposed to the reproductive and health care rights of women in this country. We need to ask the opposition why they do not want to make contraceptives free. We know they have a hidden agenda. They are against women accessing the health care and reproductive care that they need. This is one example of how they intend to make it harder for women to access and utilize their reproductive rights in this country. That is something we should all be concerned about.

Let us talk about the economy. We know that Canadians have been going through tough economic times. Global headwinds have had an impact on Canadians, just as they have on people around the world. However, the current government has stood up for the Canadian economy in the most important ways. It has done this not once, but twice. When it came to renegotiating NAFTA, when we faced an American president who decided that their main objective was to rip up the North American Free Trade Agreement, what did the Prime Minister and the then foreign minister, who is now our finance minister, do? They stood up to Americans; not only did they renegotiate NAFTA, but they also made an even better NAFTA for Canadians. What did the Leader of the Opposition and his Conservative colleagues suggest we do from day one? It was to capitulate, sign whatever we could and give away the kitchen sink. That is how the Conservatives act, but we stood up.

• (1045)

When it came to steel and aluminum tariffs, the Leader of the Opposition talked about being on the floor of Stelco. I was at Stelco when we announced that the steel and aluminum tariffs were lifted. It was the current government that did that. It is the current government that has protected steelworkers, has protected the Canadian economy and has led to Canada's having the third-highest foreign direct investment in the OECD, because that is something that we care about: creating good jobs for Canadians.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about not wanting to give Canadian jobs to Americans, but what did the Conservatives do when it came to General Motors? In order to balance the budget, they sold our shares in General Motors.

An hon. member: At a loss.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, it was at a loss; that is right, but it was the current government that made sure those GM jobs stayed in Canada. It was the current government that made sure the auto sector has the supports it needs to advance in the 21st century. We believe in fighting climate change and we believe in low-emission vehicles, and we are seeing record investment in the Canadian auto sector, not just in Ontario and Quebec but right across this country.

What do the Conservatives think? They want to get rid of all of this and forget about it. They call it corporate social welfare. Guess what, those are thousands and thousands of direct jobs that Canadians rely on to pay their bills, to send their kids to after-school activities and to make sure they have a good quality of life, and the Conservatives want to rip all of that up. However, we will continue to fight for Canadians and for good jobs in this country.

I will talk about the second time we stood up for the Canadian economy, a time that most of us would like to forget about because it was when COVID-19 came to our doors and hit us hard in Canada, just like it hit everyone hard around the world. What did we do? We said we would be there to support Canadians. Whether that was with the Canada emergency business account, the Canada emergency wage subsidy or direct payments to Canadians through CERB to ensure that they could make ends meet, we were there for Canadians every step of the way. We ensured that when it was time, when it was safe to do so, we could restart the Canadian economy; it would turn back on and Canadians could get back to work.

Business of Supply

What did the Leader of the Opposition say? He said he would not have provided any of those supports. He derided them. He said that putting government money into supporting people was a bad thing. He called that “big government”. On this side of the House, we believe that the government is there to help people. It is there to help Canadians. We do not believe, like the Conservatives opposite, that Canadians should be left to their own devices, to fend for themselves and be left on their own in times of need.

We have been there for Canadians when times were tough, and we will be there for Canadians throughout the recovery. We will be there to make sure they have what they need in order to succeed. That is exactly what we do on this side of the House, and that is exactly—

• (1050)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will interrupt the hon. member. I know she is very passionate, but every time she taps on the desk, it is a problem for the interpreters. I ask her to be mindful of that. I did not want to interrupt her, but I have to raise the point.

The hon. government House leader has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I apologize to the interpreters. I very much appreciate what they do. I will be sure to keep my hands higher up for the rest of my speech.

I will pick up where I left off.

It is extremely important for us. It is important for the government to ensure that Canadians know that everything we do is for them. It is a very different approach from what the Conservatives are proposing. We are here to stand up for Canadians' rights and economic opportunities, to defend our country and the Canadian economy, while the Conservatives do not want to defend them. They told the U.S. that in the event of a pandemic, they would do nothing. They will not be there to defend Canadians. That is extremely important.

It is really important to Canadians to ensure that we have access to good information. During his speech, the Leader of the Opposition once again said that he wants to destroy this country's media ecosystem. He said he does not want to give money to CBC/Radio-Canada. CBC/Radio-Canada is not perfect, but it is part of our history as Canadians, and it ensures that Canadians across the country, whether they are on the west coast, the east coast, in the north or in rural areas, whether they are anglophone or francophone, have access to the news.

We know why the Conservatives do not want that. When Canadians are well informed, they do not support the Conservatives. The Conservatives have a hidden agenda. They do not want Canadians to know what they will do if they come to power. Look at what happened with support for doctors. They do not want Canadians to have access to contraceptives. They do not want women's reproductive rights to be respected.

These are very important questions that Canadians might well ask Conservatives, but we all know how Conservatives are with the media. What does the opposition leader do when people ask him

tough questions? He attacks the media. Attacks on the media are attacks on Canadians, because the media asks questions on behalf of Canadians. If he truly respected Canadians and this country, he would not attack the people asking those questions on behalf of Canadians.

• (1055)

[*English*]

Today is an important day for this country, with a decision about what the future of our country will look like. There is a Leader of the Opposition who does not want to share with Canadians what he will truly do, and there is a government that is committed to advancing the well-being and the welfare of Canadians.

I understand that these times are difficult, and for many Canadians, making ends meet is a challenge right now. That is exactly why we have put forward measures that help make that a little bit easier. Whether it is the Canada child benefit, which has lifted 650,000 children out of poverty; the Canadian dental plan, which has helped 750,000 seniors and children access a dentist; pharmacare that would make diabetes medication and contraceptives free for Canadians; or the billions of dollars of investment in this country that have created thousands of good-paying jobs for Canadians, the government is committed to continuing to advance a progressive agenda that puts Canadians first and builds an inclusive and prosperous country for all.

That is what we are committed to doing. That is what drives us every single day. What there is on the other side of the aisle is a leader who only wants to tear Canada and Canadians down.

There is so much potential and so much opportunity in this country, so much we must continue to do to ensure that the generations of Canadians who have built this country into what it is, the greatest country in the world, have a government that believes in Canadians and continues to make us the envy of the world. This is where the world wants to be, and Canada wants to lead that vision for the world.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, there was so much to unpack in that speech, but I will save that for when I get up to speak to the motion.

The former Conservative government, led by former prime minister Stephen Harper, as well as our hon. colleague, the member for Abbotsford, signed more free trade agreements than any other government, including the current government. The former Conservative government also put to an end the most costly trade dispute with our partner to the south: the softwood lumber agreement.

Not only that, but we also negotiated a year's leeway time for the next government to negotiate a softwood lumber agreement. In nine years, it has failed to get a softwood lumber agreement. Mills all across our province and all across our nation, and forestry families, are out of business and out of work.

What does the member have to say to the hard-working forestry families the current government has left behind?

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I would like to reassure the member that we continue to work hard for the forestry sector in our country.

What I do want him to recall is that the moment the President of the United States said he was going to rip up NAFTA, what did former prime minister Harper say? He said to sign it, do whatever we need to do, capitulate, give in and give him whatever he wants.

The Conservatives like to say they signed agreements, but they did not sign good agreements. We signed good agreements.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is negotiation time. The government is a real minority government now. I hope that it is open to negotiation. We certainly are.

We also know that seniors suffered financial hardship during COVID-19. The cost of living went up significantly. This government increased pensions for seniors aged 75 and over, but for some strange reason, it decided to create incomprehensible discrimination and leave those aged 65 to 74 out in the cold. This injustice, this discrimination, is unacceptable as far as we are concerned.

We are talking about costs. The bottom line is that raising benefits for 65- to 74-year-olds to match those of seniors aged 75 and over would represent 0.57% of the budget. Meanwhile, oil companies are getting \$83 billion in credits.

My question is simple. What is more important to this government: oil companies or seniors?

● (1100)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows full well, Canadian seniors are an extremely important demographic for us. In fact, one of the first things we did after forming the government was boost the guaranteed income supplement for our most vulnerable seniors. That was a major change.

We have seen a decline in poverty among seniors, especially women. We know there is more to be done, and we know that seniors have suffered. Times are tough right now. To offer seniors more support, we also increased old age security for those 75 and up because the cost of living is higher for this demographic group.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, this is such an important morning, a chance for all Canadians to see parliamentarians stand up to vote non-confidence in the man who leads all the stunts from Stornoway. I am considering that the reason he is running ahead of this is his “axe the tax” claims. John Ivison, a good Conservative supporter, interviewed Ken Boessenkool, a former Harper aide, who said that there is a huge gap between what Conservatives say and what Conservatives do.

I hate to admit it, but Jason Kenney ran on “axe the tax” and then beefed up the industrial carbon tax in Alberta. Danielle Smith ran to axe the tax, and she beefed up the industrial carbon to \$170 a tonne. Boessenkool says there is no way the member for Stornoway is going to axe the tax; he is just going to continue to scare people, frighten people and divide people, and then he is going to carry on with the policies as per usual.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I do not always agree with my hon. colleague from Timmins—James Bay, but I think he hit the nail on the head just now. It is clear that the Leader of the Opposition runs on slogans. He likes to play political stunts. Today

Business of Supply

is just that. In fact, I think the member's point about this being more a vote on non-confidence in the Leader of the Opposition than it is on anything else is a cogent one.

The point of the matter is that the Leader of the Opposition is just not telling the whole truth to Canadians, and that is something we have seen with him time and time again. It is something we are seeing today clearly on display. He just cannot tell the whole truth.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canadians are becoming more and more put off by the insulting behaviour and the slogan burping of the Leader of the Opposition. They are also more and more concerned that there might be a hidden agenda.

Can my hon. colleague speak to what might be lurking in that hidden agenda?

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I think we saw on full display today that the Leader of the Opposition can only speak in half-truths. He likes to keep half of his plans hidden because he knows if he were to share his whole plan with Canadians, they would not approve.

We know, for example, that many members of his caucus are opposed to women accessing their reproductive and health care rights, yet he does not speak about it. We know that when he talks about the price on pollution, he neglects to include the fact that Canadians get a rebate. If he were to remove that price on pollution, Canadians would no longer get the rebate. There are many more issues about which he only shares half the truth. He has a real problem telling the whole truth.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, our leader has stood in the House and answered question after question when it comes to women's reproductive rights. He answered very clearly, with a simple one-word answer, when a member from the NDP asked if he was going to reopen the abortion debate. His answer was no. That is not a half-truth. That is a straightforward answer. The only people talking about this are the Liberals and they are gaslighting every step of the way.

Why is it that all the Liberals can do is gaslight, strike fear and divide Canadians? They divide indigenous and non-indigenous, vaccinated and non-vaccinated. Why is it that the only way they feel they can win is by gaslighting and dividing Canadians?

● (1105)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague is mistaken. The member from the NDP asked him whether he would cut dental care, and he did not answer the question.

Business of Supply

What Liberals talk about is based on facts. When the Conservatives were in power, what did they do? They put a global gag order on international development agencies so they could not work on sexual health and reproductive rights. When it comes to Canadians' rights, what did the Leader of the Opposition do? When he was minister for democratic reform, he made it harder for 500,000 Canadians to vote.

This is not about fear. This is not about gaslighting. This is about the actual record of the Leader of the Opposition. It is there in plain light for Canadians to see. It is only the Conservatives who are putting their heads in the sand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague opposite a question about today's opposition day. Does she think that this is a good use of taxpayer dollars and House resources?

I will read the motion as presented:

That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government.

I think that everyone can agree with that. The problem that I have with this motion is that it is too simple. I think that we could have supported it had it contained something more relevant.

We no longer have confidence in the Prime Minister and the government because of the way they are letting seniors get poorer. We no longer have confidence in the government and the Prime Minister because of the way they are leaving farmers in the lurch, particularly when it comes to supply management. We no longer have confidence in the government and the Prime Minister because of the ArriveCAN scandal and all of the spending scandals that have come with the Liberals being in power for too long. That is what I would have liked to hear the government House leader talk about.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, the Conservative leader is playing games. That is what he is doing. He likes to stir up trouble, but he does not actually have a serious proposal for Canadians. This is all just a political game to him, and it is all about his ego. His actions today are strictly in his own self-interest.

Canadians and Quebecers have nothing to gain from what he is doing today.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, to begin, I would like to note that I will be sharing my time with the member for Shefford.

In 2021, the people made a choice. Canadians and Quebecers chose a minority government. It was simply a renewal of what was in place between 2019 and 2021. I was leader at the time, and I can say that things were going well. For two years, we negotiated and discussed. Despite COVID-19, I thought we worked well together and our approach succeeded in improving life for Quebecers.

Then, the NDP and the Liberals cobbled together a majority with no respect for what had happened during the election. That is when the attacks on Quebec and on provincial jurisdictions began. For the first time in history, excessive centralization became a fact of life. Despite its difficulty in managing its own responsibilities, this government started poking its nose into the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces. In the meantime, the NDP were doing

cartwheels, wild with delight, claiming that it was the right thing to do considering the NDP's dream of seeing the provinces disappear. The New Democrats, as Mr. Duceppe once said, are just Liberals in a hurry.

Now, the situation has revolved back to the one we anticipated during the 2021 election, a minority government. One thing is very strange, however. The NDP, self-proclaimed champions of the environment, forged ties with a government that spent \$83 billion on dirty oil from western Canada. The NDP supported that government. Someone will have to explain that to me, as well.

Let us return to the topic at hand. For three weeks now, the government has found itself in a true minority status. The Bloc Québécois will try to increase its influence over this government. The Bloc will try to negotiate in an effort to make things better for Quebecers. What is good for Quebec is good for the Bloc Québécois. That is what we believed, and we have been shouting it from the rooftops.

There is a list of things we would like to accomplish.

First, there is Bill C-319, which will definitively put an end to this government's discriminatory treatment of seniors between the ages of 65 and 74.

Another priority of ours is to ensure that the bill on quotas receives royal assent so that protection is built into international agreements. There are 6,000 Quebec businesses and 100,000 workers that depend on this bill in part. We will work to finally get that bill passed and implemented.

Another important issue is distribution of asylum seekers. The government, which finally issued its *mea culpa*, must offer a solution that allows Quebecers to catch their breath. It must enhance the services offered to all Quebecers and to newcomers as well, so that they receive better service from this government. That is the position of the Bloc Québécois.

Now we have this Conservative motion is before us. The Conservatives say that it is the best new thing since sliced bread, but at some point we will all have to wake up and realize that this motion, which arrived in week two of this session and in week three of this newly minority government, has come upon us awfully fast. We in the Bloc could choose to trigger elections. In an upset last week we captured a stronghold riding, LaSalle—Émard—Verdun. We have the wind in our sails, and that is the truth. We have been at the top of the polls for some time now. We are potentially in a position to make gains.

Business of Supply

Like excited poodles hearing their owner come home, we could pull the trigger on elections. The reason we in the Bloc Québécois are exercising restraint is that our goal is not to improve our own situation. Although our members, candidates and apparatus are all ready, we are here for Quebeckers. Our work is to do what is best for them at this time, and that happens to be establishing a dialogue with a minority government, which has to reach agreements with the various opposition parties. Obviously, there is no agreement possible with the Conservative Party, so that leaves the NDP and the Bloc Québécois.

• (1110)

That is one of the reasons why we will be voting against this motion. The second reason is that there will be plenty of non-confidence votes between now and Christmas, and we see no need to hit the ground running. We will have plenty of opportunities. What we are saying is that we should give them a chance. And by “them”, we mean the Liberals. They take their sweet time on occasion, but we are going to give them a chance to show us they can earn our confidence, or, more precisely, Quebeckers' confidence. Needless to say, this is a limited-time offer. As I was saying, this government has one year left, at most. That, then, is the second reason why we will be voting against this motion. To recap, the first reason is that we want to make gains for Quebec and the second is that there is no rush; there will be other votes between now and Christmas. According to our calculations, there will be five to seven votes following this one.

There is a third reason why we will be voting against this motion. We are watching the Conservatives talk and we are not exactly convinced we want to see them take power that quickly. When we hear the Leader of the Opposition, a compulsive sloganeer if there ever was one—I mean, he spits out slogans like there is no tomorrow—we see that he basically says nothing. He offers no solutions, only slogans. We do not find this reassuring. When we listen to him speak and ask the Conservatives whether they have a plan for Quebec, their answer is no, they do not have a plan for Quebec. As far as they are concerned, Quebeckers are Canadians, and if Canadians find reasons to vote for them, Quebeckers will too. Does the idea of a distinct society ring a bell with them?

In some cases our position in Quebec differs from Canada's. There is a reason the Bloc Québécois is here. The Conservatives say it is no big deal that they are not doing anything special for Quebec. I asked the Conservatives' Quebec lieutenant if the Conservatives had a plan. He seemed taken aback by the idea of having a plan. Ten seconds later, he woke up and I heard him say with a straight face: There is no plan for Quebec, what is good for Canadians is good for Quebeckers.

We might wonder what the Quebec lieutenant is good for. What a useless role that is, being the Conservatives' Quebec lieutenant, honestly. When people want to know what the Conservatives' position is on Quebec, that is no way to handle it. The slogan king is going to start to say just about anything. It is time to limit discussions: simple question, simple answer. Otherwise, everyone gets mixed up. Even his Quebec MPs are often confused because they would like him to say things about Quebec, but the things he says are never good.

The Conservative leader just told us that they are not centralists like the Liberals. In the same breath, he says that mayors are idiots and that he is going to cut housing funds unless they do things the Conservatives' way. However, they claim they are not centralists. What else could it be called? They say they are not centralists, but they support the third link in Quebec City. If Quebeckers want a tramway instead, they will not get a cent from the federal government. A large part of the federal government's money, however, comes from Quebec. In that case, it should be returned to Quebeckers. But no, the Conservatives do not believe in public transit. They prefer a third link, but they are not centralists, not a bit.

The Act respecting the laicity of the State is universally supported in Quebec. There are some Quebecker who are against secularism, but almost all of them say that it is up to Quebeckers to decide and that the federal government should mind its own business. Instead, here is what the federal government is doing: It is using tax dollars collected from Quebeckers to hire lawyers to take the Government of Quebec to court over this law. When we tell the Conservative leader that he should oppose the government challenging a law that was democratically passed by the Quebec National Assembly, his response is that he, too, would challenge that law. What then is the difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives?

Let us talk a bit about health transfers. Quebec has made request after request. The Liberal government put together an agreement that really upset Quebeckers. They were going ballistic and coming to blows on buses. One would think maybe the Conservatives would do better, but no. They are saying that they think that the health agreement is fine the way it is.

• (1115)

I could go on for a long time. However, the idea of replacing the Liberal government with a Conservative one is not all that enticing. What would it take? It is not—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry. The hon. member can continue his thought during questions and comments.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, as always, I acknowledge and appreciate my colleague's contribution to this debate.

That said, I need to set the record straight about a few things. It always makes me laugh when he talks about the third link. Does he remember his leader's truly impressive dithering during the election campaign? In the morning, he was in favour of it; in the afternoon, he was no longer sure; and by evening, he was against it. The next day, his MPs had no idea what to do. That was the Bloc Québécois's position on the third link during the last campaign. He wants to bring it up again? Fine, but those are the facts.

He said that we are not committed and do not want to do anything. That is completely false. We set out specific commitments on housing and auto theft. They are very specific and very detailed.

Business of Supply

The Bloc Québécois folks are telling us with a straight face that they will give the government a chance. After nine years, how can the Bloc Québécois have confidence in this Prime Minister, the most centralist, wasteful and anti-Quebec prime minister we have ever had?

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, my answer is simple.

Things worked from 2019 to 2021. We made gains in Quebec because this government held a minority. At the time, I was the House leader for the Bloc Québécois. We found solutions. We made real gains for Quebec.

I am optimistic by nature. I have faith in other people. It seems to me that the Prime Minister is in a similar situation to the one he was in between 2019 and 2021. My colleague is waving his arms, but I am telling him that, if this does not work, then we will trigger an election. I look forward to seeing what the Conservatives will offer Quebecers.

• (1120)

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech and for all of the work we do together.

Could he give specific examples of what he is afraid the Conservatives will do? We know that they are going to make cuts to many programs. There are a lot of things that are important, not just for Quebecers but for Canadians, things like CBC/Radio-Canada, which the Conservatives want to get rid of.

Could my hon. colleague talk a little about the things that the Conservatives plan to do that Quebecers and Canadians should be concerned about?

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, I had already started listing them. There were a lot.

What is disappointing with the Conservatives is that they deny that Quebec, which for the time being is part of Canada, is a distinct society.

They talk about challenging Bill 21, a bill that was passed by Quebec's National Assembly. The Conservative leader also opposed Bill 96 on French in Quebec.

The Conservative leader wants to campaign on the carbon tax. He is like Don Quixote tilting at windmills. There is no carbon tax in Quebec. What will he do in Quebec for 40 days talking about something that does not exist? It is crazy.

With respect to centralization when it comes to housing and public transport, the Conservatives are centralist, but in a different way. They are not as centralizing as the Liberals and the NDP. The NDP holds that record.

Let us talk about immigration. Are they going to talk about solutions for immigration in Quebec? No, there will be nothing, like in Ouellette. There is nothing at all. That is what we are afraid of.

As long as we are switching between the Liberals and Conservatives, we will always be stuck with one or the other. We need to get rid of the federal government. That is the solution.

[English]

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have noticed the tendency of the Conservatives to mislead Canadians. In the previous member's speech, there was a comment that, when the Conservatives were in power, Quebecers were just happy.

There were huge movements to stop the cuts we were seeing from the Conservatives and the undermining of student rights and of women's rights with the cuts to women's programs. I am wondering if the member could speak to the danger of Conservatives when it comes to the health and well-being of Quebecers.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, we learned this week that a Conservative member attended an event where people were against abortion. That is problematic. People might have questions, but hearing things like that does not make things any easier.

When it comes to health, the problem is that the federal government is encroaching on Quebec's jurisdictions. Health is not a federal jurisdiction; it is Quebec's jurisdiction. The experts are in Quebec and in the provinces. That is their job. With all due respect, I would say to my NDP colleague and to the Liberals that the government needs to give Quebec the money, because Quebec is the expert. Quebec will manage that money properly.

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is thrilled to see that the NDP-Liberal coalition appears to have come to an end. The people elected a minority government in 2019 and did not give anyone a blank cheque in 2021. The Bloc Québécois has a lot of weight when it comes to promoting Quebec's priorities and interests.

With the NDP-Liberal alliance, we again found ourselves with a government that completely ignores Quebec, its needs, its priorities and the consensus reached by the National Assembly. There has been a growing centralization of decision-making power and, as a result, Canadians are deciding what is done in Quebec. There has also been a repeated rejection of Quebec's positions as expressed in unanimous resolutions in our National Assembly. Normally, when the National Assembly is unanimous, there is nothing more to be said.

I will start with a few examples.

There are the infrastructure programs. Quebec has requested the federal government to transfer the amounts unconditionally, since this is not federal infrastructure and Quebec must be free to manage its own land as it sees fit. The federal government has ignored this request. Worse yet, they added insult to injury by creating a federal department in charge of provincial infrastructure and municipalities. Even the Leader of the Opposition tried to get tough on municipalities.

There are the housing programs. Quebec asked that Ottawa respect its jurisdiction and simply help improve its programs. Not only did the Liberal-NDP alliance ignore that, but Quebec got burned and received less than its share of the money spent on new federal programs.

Business of Supply

Quebec has repeatedly rejected federal interference through a myriad of unanimous resolutions. Every one of them has been ignored by the federal government, which continues to increase the number of federal strategies in areas that are not under its jurisdiction. Take, for example, the labour force, federal strategies addressing various aspects of health care, and the rejection of Quebec's consensus on advance requests for MAID. As the critic for seniors, I hear a lot about this last point.

Then we have the inadequate transfers to Quebec, which are not increasing quickly enough to meet the population's needs. This results in overcrowded classrooms and a health care system that is close to its breaking point. More substantial health transfers are urgently needed.

There again, they developed a whole range of federal programs in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction with money that should have been used to properly fund Quebec's essential programs. I will give an example. Last June, we criticized the age well at home initiative, a program launched by the federal government through the back door during its last campaign in Quebec. Lastly, Quebec groups do not have the money they should have. The Quebec minister responsible for seniors is asking that the funds be transferred. She has a home care plan but no, the federal government wants to set conditions.

All this is happening while the federal government, which barely provides Canadians with any services, managed to find the funding to hire 109,000 additional federal public servants whose main duty appears to be to tell Quebecers what to do. In committee, I asked why we were outsourcing more. I did not get an answer.

The fiscal and environmental policy is largely focused on the needs of western Canada, with \$83 billion in tax credits to the oil companies, plus \$34 billion of our money pumped into the Trans Mountain pipeline. I will get back to this later. I would like people to stop telling me that we do not have enough money to implement Bill C-319.

Second, there have been changes in the House. The constituents of LaSalle—Émard—Verdun did well by Quebec last week by electing the Bloc Québécois candidate, adding to Quebec's voice and its political weight. I hope that we will be able to welcome our 33rd member of the Bloc Québécois soon.

The Bloc Québécois wants to know whether the government has taken note of this change and whether there will be a realignment that will allow Quebecers to get something from the government soon. Only then will we be able to determine whether the government should fall or whether it should be given a little more time to fix its mistakes and take our priorities into account. We want more for Quebec. Rather than blindly opposing or supporting the Liberal or Conservative parties, the Bloc Québécois wants to move forward with issues that Quebecers care about. If it is good for Quebec, we will support it. If it is not good for Quebec, we will reject it. This is nothing new; it is not a surprise. We have always been very clear where we stand. It is not as if we woke up one morning and decided on that.

In 2021, our campaign slogan was simply “Québécois”, or “Quebeckers”, to make it clear that, for us, only Quebec matters. In 2019, it was “Le Québec, c’est nous”, or “We are Quebec”, to indi-

cate that we were the ones who would carry the Quebec consensus. In 2015, it was “On a tout à gagner”, or “We have everything to gain”, to make it clear that the Bloc Québécois was going to work to make Quebec win in Ottawa and achieve gains for Quebec. Today we are giving this government one last chance to earn our trust, to take immediate action for Quebecers.

Fourth, let us talk about priorities. As a first step, we are calling on the new minority government to give royal recommendation to Bill C-319, which would put an end to the two classes of seniors and increase old age security by 10% for seniors between the ages of 65 and 74.

● (1125)

Old age security is one of the rare truly federal social programs. While the federal government meddles in many things, it has neglected its primary responsibilities. We want to give the government a chance to realign itself, assume its basic responsibilities and enable seniors to live a decent life.

According to the OECD, Canada is one the industrialized nations where the population faces the greatest decline in purchasing power on retirement. We could do much better. I do not want to hear that it costs too much. It would cost \$3 billion a year. That represents 0.57% of government spending.

Earlier, my hon. colleague from La Prairie aptly said that it is not the cost that is stopping the government; it just has other priorities. There is the \$34 billion to buy and build the Trans Mountain pipeline and the \$83 billion in tax gifts to the oil companies. Do they really need it? The government paid \$2 billion to Sun Life, a private company, to run the federal dental insurance plan when this could have been done for free with a transfer to Quebec. It is an area under Quebec's responsibility.

We are asking the government, which is now a minority government, to focus on its responsibilities. Its central mission is to protect our people, especially retirees between the ages of 65 and 74, the people it deliberately set aside in favour of its own priorities, which are not Quebecers' priorities. The rest will be judged on merit.

We will oppose even the slightest interference, including on a confidence vote. If the government ever contradicts the unanimous will of Quebec's National Assembly in the slightest, we will oppose it, including on a confidence vote. When we find that the government has failed to recognize its minority status and the importance of heeding the Bloc Québécois's demands, which are widely supported in Quebec, we will pull the plug. Doing so today, before we even know whether the government is cognizant of the new reality, would amount to taking a decent retirement income away from Quebec seniors.

Business of Supply

What is more, we promised farmers that we would do everything in our power to protect supply management. As the member for Shefford, I have no choice but to say it. The members for Montcalm, Berthier—Maskinongé and Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot will be in the Senate tomorrow morning to encourage senators to quickly pass our Bill C-282, which was passed by the House almost a year and a half ago. This bill would prevent any future government from creating new breaches in the supply management system for farmers in Quebec. That is crucial. These are real issues facing real people, not the frenzied spectacle that the Conservatives are putting on today.

Voting in favour of the Conservatives' motion would be irresponsible and unworthy of the mandate Quebecers gave us to defend them. As members of Parliament, our work is to represent and defend our constituents. That is why we were elected.

The Conservatives' motion has nothing to do with any issue whatsoever. In fact, the Conservatives' motion is just a game. We have all seen the polls, and we know that the current government is nearing its end. What is more, we are eager to ask Quebecers again for their support. We have always done everything we can to show them we are worthy of their trust. That is what we are doing once again today. Given the results of the LaSalle—Émard—Verdun by-election, we have nothing to fear on that account.

However, it is far from certain that a new government will be for the best. Every time the Conservative Party talks about public policy, it is to ask for the elimination of the carbon tax outside Quebec. There is absolutely nothing for Quebecers in that.

Claiming that the Bloc Québécois has become friends with the federal Liberals is just nonsense. We trust Quebecers, but the House of Commons and the federal government are controlled by Canadians. Moreover, the Bloc Québécois has no faith in any government in the federal system. Today's motion would have us choose between the Liberals and the Conservatives in Canada, but we choose Quebec. We want more for Quebec. Right now, we are trying to help our people. Then we will decide if it is worth it, but not today.

A majority of the House of Commons passed Bill C-319 in principle. After a detailed study of the text, the committee unanimously returned it to the House of Commons for final passage, which could happen within the next few weeks.

There is, however, a problem. Since the bill involves spending, the government has veto rights. We are asking the government to lift its veto and give royal recommendation to Bill C-319 so Parliament can pass it at third reading. In committee, the members from all parties voted in favour of the bill. However, today, when it comes time to buckle down and implement the bill, the Liberals and Conservatives appear to be hesitating. I remind you that the first part of the bill aims to eliminate discrimination based on age. Let us put an end to this unacceptable inequity.

In the 2021 budget, the Liberals created two classes of seniors. People aged 75 and over saw their pension increase by 10%. People between the ages of 65 and 74 got nothing. It is time to put an end to this. I am not the only one saying it: Every seniors' group I have

talked to in my two-year tour agrees. I see my colleagues. I met with seniors in Mirabel, Terrebonne and Abitibi-Témiscamingue.

• (1130)

Everyone agrees, including the people at FADOQ. Enough is enough. Let us put an end to this unacceptable inequity. Let us give the government one last chance. We must seek royal recommendation for the dignity of seniors.

[English]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, just a few days ago, Quebec Premier François Legault urged the Bloc Québécois to vote with the Conservatives on this confidence motion and send Canadians into a carbon tax election.

Why does that member, as well as her leader, disrespect the will and request of the premier of her province, who has said that the Prime Minister and his government disrespect Quebecers every day?

• (1135)

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Speaker, I already answered this question in my speech. I spoke of the motions unanimously adopted in Quebec's National Assembly. As far as I know, there has not been a motion in the National Assembly to trigger an election. Our demand is clear: When a motion is adopted unanimously in the National Assembly, we represent and defend the interests of Quebecers. That, however, is not the case when it comes to the question my colleague just asked me.

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is another dismal day in the House playing these games with the member for Stornoway, yet we learned this morning that 492 people in Lebanon were murdered by the Israeli Air Force, 90 who were children. We have learned continually about the direct murder of doctors, journalists, students and children in Gaza, war crimes against humanity—

Mr. Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You had already mentioned to that colleague that he address, recognize and mention members using their appropriate titles. The “member for Stornoway” is not an appropriate title.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is a point of debate.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I am not surprised at the absolute disinterest in the murder of children and crimes against humanity from the members of the Conservative Party, but Canada needs to take a better stand. We have to speak up for the rule of international law, something the Conservatives are refusing to do and the Liberals are hiding on.

Humanity is watching us at this moment. Are we going to stand up to end the mass killings by the Israeli army in Lebanon and Gaza, yes or no?

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Madam Speaker, that comes back to what I was saying in my speech about how we have to wonder whether we would really be better served by the Liberals or the Conservatives. Our leader said that it is a bit like being bitten by a snake or a tarantula. When it comes to foreign affairs, neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals, who said that Canada was back, have proven that they are truly capable of showing leadership on the international stage. I hope that Quebec will soon speak with its own voice in the community of nations, so that it can share its ideas on international relations.

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we are debating a Conservative motion that is really about the price on pollution. That may interest the Bloc Qu b cois. We know the Conservatives do not believe that climate change is real. Could my colleague tell us why it is important to have a climate change plan and why that is important to Quebeckers and Canadians?

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Madam Speaker, I talked about that in my speech as well. We are asking the Liberals to be logical. They cannot have a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while they continue to fund oil companies. Come on. The Bloc Qu b cois is logical. We want oil company funding and subsidies to end because climate change and the environment are crucial issues. That said, since this is probably my last opportunity to speak, I will warn the Liberals to stop taking intellectual shortcuts and spreading disinformation in their answers.

This is not the first time Bloc Qu b cois members have advocated for seniors. It is part of our history and our DNA. I would remind the Conservatives that we voted against the last few budgets because the Liberals were unable to deliver the number-one thing we wanted. Ever since I have been here, we have been asking the Liberals to end this unacceptable inequality and take care of seniors by increasing old age security for everyone. That is why I am telling the Liberals to stop taking intellectual shortcuts. The Bloc Qu b cois has always advocated for seniors, and we will continue to do so.

[English]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

[Translation]

People across the country strongly believe that we should help each other and that caring for our neighbours makes us stronger. One value we all share is our support for a universal and entirely free public health care system. Unfortunately, decades of budget cuts have put our health care system at risk. We know that Conservative leaders have made cuts to health care in the past. The Conservative Party did the same during its time in office and wants to do so again. It voted against dental care and universal pharmacare. It continually votes against our health care system.

As a result, unless our health care system receives sufficient funding, people will have to wait longer for the services they need. The Conservatives want to privatize our health care system. This

means that people will have to pay for access to services, which goes against Canadians' values.

We saw that the Liberals did not have the courage or the strength to stop the Conservatives' budget cuts across the country. The Conservative premiers, like Danielle Smith, Doug Ford and even Fran ois Legault, have all three continued to privatize our system. People are having to pay out of pocket instead of getting free services. People are paying the price.

The NDP wants to strengthen our health care system. We want to work with the provinces to have a stronger health care system. We believe in the value of keeping a universal, public and completely free system. That is why we will vote against the Conservatives' motion, against the idea of making cuts to our health care system, in services that people need. We will vote against the Conservatives' motion.

• (1140)

[English]

Canadians believe fundamentally that we are better off when we take care of each other, when we look out for our neighbours, when we look out for one another and when we lift each other up. When we do that, we all rise together.

Everyone should be able to have a good job that allows them to find a place they can afford to live in, to put food on the table and to have a fridge full of groceries. We believe fundamentally that Canadians share the value, as the New Democrats do, of having a health care system that is public, universal and completely free, so people do not have to pay out of pocket.

We do not believe that Canadians should have to worry about racking up credit card debt to see a doctor. People should not have to worry about choosing to pay for a doctor over buying groceries for their family. This should not be a choice that Canadians have to make. We believe in a system that is there for people when they need it.

Sadly, people are losing hope. They see our health care system eroding. They see that it is impossible to build a good life. They see costs continuing to rise. They see that it is harder to put food on the table, to buy groceries and to pay rent.

Also, Canadians are worried each time they have to take their loved ones to see a doctor or when they get care for themselves. They are worried that getting better will be connected to a bill, a bill to see the doctor or to join a membership to even see a doctor. Canadians are worried that there is going to be a bill attached to buying the medication they need to stay well.

Business of Supply

A bill for health care is the cost of the Conservatives. Every time Canadians see a doctor to get the health care they or their loved ones need, there will be a bill. When the member for Carleton was in cabinet, and let us be very clear, contrary to what he said, he and his party cut and gut health care. In fact, the Conservatives cut \$43.5 billion out of health care.

The Conservatives might try to play loose with the facts, but the reality is that they cut health care, and it hurt. Premiers lined up to complain about the Harper cuts. People lined up to say that it was wrong. The Conservatives cut and it hurt. In fact, right off the bat, they cut 163 Canadian doctors and nurses. Wait times got longer. It was harder to find a family doctor. Waiting times in the emergency room skyrocketed. The wait for surgeries ballooned. People felt the pain. There is a cost to the Conservatives, and that cost is that people pay the price.

We do not have to look very far. We know that cutting health care is at the very core of Conservative values. We can see that happening right now. Conservative premiers are, brick by brick, trying to destroy our health care system. In Ontario, we know that Doug Ford is gleefully cutting health care, destroying our public health care system, putting health care workers and money into private clinics, which starves public health care, starves the public hospitals, and people end up waiting longer and longer to get that care. Conservative Premier Danielle Smith is destroying health care in Alberta. This is what Conservatives do. Look to any Conservative province, look to any province where Conservatives have been in power, and look at the state of the health care system. It will be in shambles, because that is what Conservatives do. They cut health care and people know it.

The more the Conservatives cut, the more the health care system falls apart. They set up the argument that now that they have starved this thing, now that they have broken it and it is not working, they will sell it to their greedy CEO corporate buddies and let them profit from it. For the Conservatives, they see sick people as an untapped cash cow. They look at sick people and ask how they can profit from their pain. They ask how they can profit from people who are sick. They ask how they can help their corporate buddies make money from their pain.

Right now, companies like Maple are charging Canadians up to \$100 to visit a doctor, on top of a membership fee that they have to subscribe to be on the list to see those doctors. Who owns Maple? It turns out that it is owned by Loblaw. For the Conservatives, when it comes to the same corporate grocery store that sets our grocery prices and is ripping us off, they want it to also set the prices when it comes to seeing a doctor.

Here is what is even more shocking. The chief adviser to the Conservatives, Jenni Byrne, is a lobbyist for none other than Loblaw. Conservative insiders are directly benefiting from the privatization of our health care system. The Conservatives want to stop pharmacare. They voted against increases to our health care system in February 2023. They want to cut the pensions of people. They want to cut dental care.

We want to strengthen pensions. We want to expand dental care. We want to ensure health care is there for us when we need it. They want to cut health care. We want to shorten wait times. That is why

we are not going to let the leader of the Conservatives call the shots. We are going to vote today against Conservative cuts and against a Conservative motion.

Let us take a minute to talk about the Liberals. The Liberals claim that they care about our health care system. They claim that they want to defend it, as if they are not in power and do not have the power to do something about it. When I mention the cuts that are happening to health care by provincial premiers, the Liberal government is standing by and letting them do it. It is letting our health care system be privatized. The Liberals are not using the federal tools, the tools that we have in the Canada Health Act. They are allowing it to happen.

In fact, we put forward a motion to stop the flow of public money, at the federal level, going to for-profit clinics. That motion was a strong signal to say that, no, we would not let this happen anymore. What did the Liberals do? They voted against that motion. They voted to allow for-profit companies to continue to starve our public health care system. When the private system takes all the health care workers and all the money, there is less in the public system and people have to wait longer in the ER rooms. They have to wait longer for their public care.

The Liberal government has done nothing to ban for-profit companies from scooping up health care workers. We have seen it do nothing to stop for-profit clinics that continue to rip off Canadians. It is because the Liberal government is too weak to stand up to Danielle Smith, too weak to stand up to Doug Ford and, frankly, too weak to stop the Conservative cuts proposed by the federal Conservatives. The Liberals are telling Canadians, when Conservative premiers tell us to pay up or wait longer, that this is okay, that they are going to do nothing about it.

● (1145)

We believe the next election is about an important choice for Canadians. After decades of cuts and broken promises, Canadians are going to need us to work to restore hope and give them relief. The next election is about that choice. It will be a choice between the cuts of Conservatives or the hope and relief of New Democrats. Hope and relief mean homes we can actually afford and not, as the Conservatives want, helping out their corporate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry. I did indicate that the member needed to wrap up, and the mics were closed before I got up. I think the technical team will take note of that for next time, but we are over time.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

Business of Supply

• (1150)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, there we go. There is the leader who has propped up the Prime Minister for the last four and a half years and sided with the government over 50 times when it levied time allocation and closure on bills, silencing the rest of the House. He is the leader who is complicit in the cover-ups and scandals we have seen from the Prime Minister over the last four and a half years.

Canadians really do have a choice: a leader who is Twitter tough or somebody who will truly stand up for Canadians, a leader who has covered up the scandals and corruption of the Prime Minister or somebody who will make life more affordable for Canadians under a Conservative government.

Canadians truly do have a choice to make: somebody who is Twitter tough and talks tough on social media or somebody who will actually be there for Canadians.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, let us talk about that choice. We are talking about health care today. I talked about the fact that the Conservative leader voted against dental care, voted against pharmacare and voted against increases to health care. Conservative premiers are destroying health care. They are cutting and gutting it. People out there can look at any province with a Conservative premier and look at the state of health care. They are destroying it. That is what the Conservatives want to do.

I asked a question directly of the member for Carleton about whether he would cut the dental care program and he did not answer. He does not have the courage to tell us to our faces, but we know what he would do. He would cut our health care system and make life harder for people. He would help his corporate buddies, for sure, and he would hurt Canadians.

That is the choice that Canadians will make in the next election. Do they want someone who will stand up for working-class people or someone who will help their corporate buddies? The choice is clear.

Hon. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my question for the NDP leader relates to the Conservative leader apparently having #incel on his YouTube sites for a number of years. I will quote what that means. According to Wikipedia, it means “involuntary celibate”. It is “a term associated with an online subculture of people (mostly white, male, and heterosexual)”. It blames, objectifies and denigrates women and girls as a result of someone being involuntarily celibate.

I would like the views of the NDP leader on why the Conservative leader put that hashtag, #incel, on his YouTube channel. What was the result he was trying to achieve?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, the leader of the Conservatives might have to answer that question more directly. We know the Conservatives like to do a lot of distracting from what is really going on and distracting from the truth.

Let us talk about what the Conservatives would actually do. They want to cut and gut health care. They want to cut pharmacare. They want to cut dental care. We know that people are benefiting from this program.

I have met with people on it. I met with Sue, a retired senior on a fixed income and cancer survivor who, because of her cancer treatment, lost her teeth. I was with her at the dentist's office when she was told that she was going to get her smile back, and she broke down in tears of joy. That is who the Conservatives want to attack. They want to strip Sue of the dignity of getting her teeth fixed. That is what we are fighting against today.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on finally ripping up the agreement with the Liberal Party and for realizing that the Liberal Party, the Government of Canada, is incredibly incompetent.

It is incompetent because it did not take care of its own responsibilities. It was more concerned with lecturing and teaching lessons, with the encouragement of the NDP, to the provinces, like Quebec, who have been managing their health care system for a long time.

Does my colleague not think that it would be important for the government to refocus on its priorities and its responsibilities and take care of seniors, for example?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, we strongly believe in taking care of seniors, taking care of one another. That is a fundamental belief for New Democrats.

I agree that the Liberals often talk the talk, but do not walk the walk. It is obvious that we were the ones who forced the government to implement the dental care program. This program will help people throughout the country, especially in Quebec. The Bloc Québécois voted against this idea, against this program that helps so many people in Quebec, even more than in other provinces. We think this program is important, and the Bloc Québécois will have to explain why it voted against it.

• (1155)

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak right after the leader of the NDP, who gave an excellent speech. He outlined the framework for this discussion and explained where we stand right now as a society, what people need and the risks associated with either the Liberals' inaction or the Conservatives' cuts.

Over the past two years, we have seen what can be achieved when NDP members are on the job. We delivered results by pressuring the government and making real gains for people, for workers, for seniors, for families and for students. That is the contribution the NDP caucus can make, using its position of strength and balance of power to obtain things that neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals had ever agreed to before.

Business of Supply

With a bit of a wink and a nudge, I would like to point out that, for two years, the Bloc Québécois criticized us for negotiating with the Liberals to make gains. Now that we have torn up the agreement, it is rather ironic to see the Bloc Québécois wanting to negotiate with the government as well, but that is politics, after all.

We were able to achieve tangible progress of historic importance. Think of the 10 days of paid sick leave for federally regulated workers, which did not exist before. We saw how important it was to grant workers this right during the COVID-19 pandemic. It was the NDP that did that.

The anti-scab law is finally in effect, 50 years after Quebec passed its own law. We fought and forced the Liberal government to introduce anti-scab legislation, which was a historic demand of the Quebec and Canadian labour movement. I am very proud to have been able to negotiate with the then minister of labour. It is an important piece of legislation that is a true hallmark of the gains the NDP was able to achieve. The anti-scab legislation is a victory for the NDP.

The big one is universal public pharmacare. This is so important to so many members of society, in both Canada and Quebec, who are suffering because our hybrid private-public system is flawed. The NDP was able to get \$1.5 billion. The bill is currently before the Senate. This will make a difference in people's lives, especially the first phase that provides access to contraception and diabetes medications. Millions of people with diabetes will be reimbursed for the cost of supplies and drugs to fight this terrible disease. This is a victory for the NDP and its work. It is also what the Quebec labour movement is calling for. The FTQ, the CSN, the CSQ and the Union des consommateurs du Québec all know that a universal public pharmacare program is the best way to get truly affordable drugs to treat people and save lives. That has been proven in study after study over the past few years.

We secured \$8 billion for indigenous housing. We forced the Liberals to ensure that the federal child care transfer will go to public and not-for-profit child care run by community groups and non-profits. That is a win for the NDP.

There is also the Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act, which ensures a just transition, a green energy transition, as well as job creation for workers. The NDP fought to have union and worker representatives at the table to ensure the success of this transition, which is so important to the future of our planet, our economic development, and good jobs for workers. I salute the work of some of my colleagues, including my colleague from Victoria, who is right over there. I also salute my colleague from Timmins—James Bay for his very hard work on Bill C-50.

Obviously, the NDP deserves credit for all the work it accomplished on providing people with access to dental care. Some of them had not been able to afford a visit to the dentist in years. We were able to secure these major gains by putting pressure on the Liberals. So far, 3.5 million people in Canada have registered for the program. Some 645,000 people have managed to see a dentist and be reimbursed all or 80% of the cost of their dental care. That is huge. The health and lives of those 645,000 people has changed for the better through the direct efforts of the NDP here in the House. I am very proud to say that those 645,000 people include

205,032 Quebeckers, who were able to see a dentist thanks to the NDP's work and victory.

• (1200)

This means that 32% of the people who have benefited from the program are Quebeckers. The program is therefore very beneficial for Quebec, for Quebeckers, who are participating more on average than people in the other provinces. We represent 23% of the Canadian population, but 32% of the people who have received this service are from Quebec. I would remind the House that not only did the Bloc Québécois oppose dental care, but the Conservatives have always voted against it, and the Liberals also voted against it before the last election. This just goes to show that if we had not been there, if we had not twisted their arm, this would never have happened.

The agreement lasted a while, but we were not married to the Liberals. We were carpooling. We eventually realized that it was time to go our separate ways, so we got out of that car and into our own, to regain our independence and autonomy. Going forward, we will decide on a case-by-case basis how we are going to vote in the House as a political party.

We also put an end to this agreement because of a build-up of frustration with the Liberals' inaction, half-measures and lack of courage on a whole host of issues. We decided that we are going to be completely autonomous. There are some things that we completely disagree with the Liberals on and so we want to be able to exert all the pressure we can and to do our job as the opposition as effectively as possible. I am talking in particular about environmental and climate issues.

One can only imagine how infuriating it is to face the Liberals' inaction and contradictions, when this failure to make the necessary decisions today is going to affect future generations, our children and our grandchildren. In the last budget, the Liberals backtracked on taxing the excessive profits of big oil. Big oil lobbyists came to Ottawa, to the office of the finance minister, and the government decided that it would not tax the windfall profits of oil and gas companies after all.

The fact that there is no emissions cap in the oil and gas sector is shameful. One has to wonder why it still has not been set. Then there are the tax credits for carbon capture, an unproven technology that does not work. It is a great subsidy for the oil companies, but not as great as buying the Trans Mountain pipeline, which cost Canadians \$36 billion.

That \$36 billion means that everyone in the country, whether they are a grandpa, a grandma, a student or a baby, paid \$1,000 to buy that pipeline and increase our greenhouse gas emissions. The Liberals took \$1,000 from every Canadian to buy a pipeline that no one wanted. Even the private sector did not want it.

There is also the matter of the inaction in relation to the housing crisis and the price of groceries, despite the fact that there are solutions. There is the Liberals' lack of courage regarding the genocide in Gaza, the lack of recognition of the Palestinian state, the lack of sanctions against Netanyahu's extremist ministers, and the continued sale of arms to this regime, which has been dropping bombs on ordinary people every day for over 10 months now. Then there is the Liberals' failure to reform EI, despite their promises.

Although we are debating this motion today, the NDP's message is clear. We will not play the Conservatives' game. We are not going to play the Conservatives' game, because we remember the dark years under Stephen Harper.

We remember the attacks on science, the blindness or indifference to the climate crisis and the cuts to culture. We remember the \$43 billion in cuts to our public health care system, the repercussions of which are still being felt today. When the Liberals came to power, they did not reverse those budget cuts.

They cut seniors' pensions by increasing the retirement age to 67. They abolished 26,000 public service jobs and closed nine Veterans Affairs Canada offices. They made cuts to employment insurance, to support for indigenous communities, to protection for women and women's issues.

As far as women's rights are concerned, the right to abortion is still under threat. Things are not entirely clear in the Conservative caucus. Statements are vague. There are photos with certain groups, with certain demonstrators here on Parliament Hill. This morning, in the *Journal de Montréal* we read that the Conservative member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands visited a creationist and anti-abortion, or anti-choice, church in Florida.

He was invited to deliver a speech at an extremist church in Florida, and it was the church that paid for not only his flight, but also all the expenses. A Conservative member went to Florida and was paid by a church to speak against women's rights. After all that, it should come as no surprise that people question whether the Conservatives will protect women's rights or if a private member's bill will be introduced if ever, by some misfortune, the Conservatives form a majority government.

• (1205)

I see that my time is up. I could have gone on. I still have a lot more to say, but I can elaborate in my answers to the questions and comments.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before we move on to questions and comments, two points of order have

Business of Supply

been raised. I said I would get back to the House on one of them. As for the other, I said it was more of a point of debate.

[*English*]

I want to go back to those points or order. Although both of them are in the grey zone, I do want to remind members to be careful about the words they choose. The hon. member for Victoria got up on a point of order about the leader of the official opposition mentioning the “sellout of the NDP”. The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George rose on a point of order about the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay talking about the “member from Stornoway”. Those kinds of statements fall within a grey zone.

However, there was a decision made by the Speaker in October 2023, and it specifically indicated that there was a:

...growing tendency to make pointed criticisms in a way that is unnecessarily personal and designed to denigrate, bully, elicit an emotional reaction or attack the integrity of the person introduces a toxicity into our proceedings that hampers our ability to get things done. This includes coming up with fake titles for members in order to mock them or making comments that question their courage, honesty or commitment to their country.

For the one instance, when we are saying something about a party, it applies to each and every member of that party. For the other instance, when we do not address a member by the title that has been assigned to them within the hierarchy of this place, whether it is a parliamentary role, within the official opposition or a member of Parliament, it creates disorder in the House. That applies not only to debate but also to question period.

We have seen over the last little while that there has been a lot of disorder. I would ask all members to be respectful of each other in the House and to debate the policies, not what individuals bring to the House through name-calling or through calling the parties themselves names.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CONFIDENCE IN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE GOVERNMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, what hypocrisy we have heard from that member and his party when they are criticizing the Liberal government. Over the last three years, they have enabled the government to increase taxes on Canadians at every single juncture, whether through its budgets or the implementation of the carbon tax, which affects the cost of everything. He talked a lot about cuts, but he supported the carbon tax initiation, as well as every single increase since then, with his party through the government. This has increased the cost of housing, the cost of food, the cost of fuel and the cost of energy for every single Canadian.

My question is very simple. Why did that member and his party cut the disposable income of every single Canadian?

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, what the NDP actually did was help people who needed it the most through the Canada housing benefit and the dental care program.

If the Conservatives ever get into power, what will they do with dental care? They will end seniors' access to dentists after 3.5 million people have already registered for the program and 645,000 people have benefited from it. I have called people who went to the dentist and saved \$2,900 on dental care, dentures or prosthetics. That is nothing to sneer at. Some people were reimbursed the full cost of their treatments. That is money paid to them directly that they are able to save.

I fail to understand why the Conservatives insist on opposing social programs that give people access to better services and cost them nothing.

• (1210)

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech given by the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

I want to do a little analysis. After three years of the agreement with the NDP, there have been no gains for Quebec. We have to give the NDP a little credit for the anti-scab legislation, which is a necessary measure. However, the gains for Quebec that they are claiming to have achieved are related to issues that fall under Quebec's jurisdiction and for which no money has been transferred.

Now that the current political situation has us dealing with a minority government, what gains would my colleague like to see for Quebec, since he did not achieve any when he had a monopoly for three years?

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, it is a bit much to say that we did not make any gains for Quebec. Try saying that to the Videotron or Port of Québec employees who were locked out because there was no anti-scab legislation. We defended the cause and won more rights for workers.

Paying dentists' bills is not interfering in Quebec's health care system. We are not telling Quebec how to run its hospitals. So far, 205,032 people in Quebec have gone to the dentist thanks to the work of the NDP. We campaigned on that promise. We did it for Quebecers. We are talking 205,000 people in Quebec alone. Quebec accounts for 32% of the people who have benefited from the program, yet we represent 23% of the population. The province that benefits most from the dental care program is Quebec.

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think there is really important question to be asked about the urgency of the member who lives in Stornoway trying to go to an election now. We learned from Erin O'Toole—

The Deputy Speaker: Going back to what the hon. Speaker before me brought up, members are not to use false titles for individuals.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I had actually said that he lives in Stornoway. I did not say he was from Stornoway.

We do know that Erin O'Toole has testified that it was interference from the Chinese Communist Party that helped bring him down and get the new member elected. We know that the leader of the Conservatives is unable to get a security clearance. What does it say about the only leader in Canadian history who has refused or cannot get a security clearance, and who is under a cloud that his election as Conservative leader—

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member just falsely stated that the Leader of the Opposition is unable to get a security clearance. That is blatantly false.

The Deputy Speaker: That is a point of debate.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, he cannot have a security clearance, but is he calling an election because Erin O'Toole has now said that it was the Chinese Communist Party that took Erin O'Toole out as leader of the Conservative Party while the rest of the droogs on the backbench went along with the new leader.

The Deputy Speaker: Members are using words to call out other members of Parliament. We are all honourable members in this chamber.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, one thing we know for sure is that the Leader of the Opposition did not ask for access to privileged information about foreign interference. That is very serious, because he says he wants to be prime minister, but he is not doing the work to find out what really happened. That says a lot about the leader of the Conservative Party, who is not who he claims to be. We know that he is no friend of ordinary people. He is no friend of workers at all. We all know he is a fake. When he was minister, he attacked workers' rights with Bill C-377 and Bill C-525.

We were there. I was there. I remember it. I do not want to relive those attacks on people, workers and public services.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Cariboo—Prince George.

“That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government.” It is a simple motion, a few words that, in a few hours, will reveal the true nature of the members of this 44th Parliament. Everyone in the House, be they Conservative, Bloc Québécois, NDP, Green Party or even independent, will have to reveal—

[English]

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Conservatives seem quite steadfast in wanting to take the government down, yet they do not seem to want to show up. May I please ask if there is quorum in the chamber?

Business of Supply

The Deputy Speaker: I will ask the clerk to count the members present.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: With 20 members, we do have quorum.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

● (1215)

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, the motion states, and I quote, “That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government.” It is a simple motion that, in a few words, will reveal the true nature of this 44th Parliament. Everyone in the House, whether Conservative, Bloc Québécois, NDP, Green, Liberal or even independent, will have to reveal whether they have confidence in this Prime Minister, after nine years of Liberal governance that has changed Canada like no other prime minister has ever done before, a prime minister in a minority government who, up until now, had bought his survival by making a pact with the NDP.

Listening to the leader of the NDP, in the past and again just recently, extol the virtues of his decision to enter into this coalition, a coalition that went against the choice of voters in the last election, one cannot help but draw a comparison with a certain fable from La Fontaine that I would like to quote:

An envious little frog,
Not bigger than an egg,
A stately bullock spies,
And, smitten with his size,
Attempts to be as big...

Does anyone see the similarity? The conclusion is even more revealing and explosive.

“Is this enough?” “No, no.”
“Well, then, is this?” “Poh! poh!”

The frog continues to swell.

“Enough! you don't begin to be.” And thus the reptile sits,
Enlarging till she splits.

That is how the NDP-Liberal coalition blew up, leaving no trace of the little orange frog, not that the bullock cares.

That is what just happened. Their deal had a disastrous impact on Canadian families, workers and businesses. The no-good Liberal government survived thanks to that deal, but it caused the worst inflation we have seen in 40 years. This Prime Minister increased the national debt more than all of his predecessors combined. Violent crime is on the rise across Canada. The streets are getting more dangerous. Too many Canadians are living on the street or in tents because they can no longer afford an apartment or because they are victims of the hard-drug epidemic plaguing the country.

This bad Liberal government, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, doubled our national debt with over \$500 billion in inflationary spending. Bloc Québécois members have voted nearly 200 times to keep the most incompetent prime minister in our history in power. This bad government literally killed the dream that young Canadians have of one day owning their own home. This bad government is responsible for so many ethical breaches that we

do not have enough fingers to count them. This bad Liberal government, to satisfy its Prime Minister's obvious natural propensity for spending, did not hesitate for a second to trample on provincial jurisdictions. This bad Liberal government succeeded in swelling the public service by over 40%, hiring more than 100,000 new public servants, yet Canadians cannot get simple answers to their questions over the phone. We can all testify to that.

Following a misguided tweet from the Prime Minister, this bad Liberal government completely destroyed an immigration system that was working relatively well, pushing Quebec to a breaking point. As for social services, infrastructure is not keeping pace with the rhythm imposed by this post-national Prime Minister. This Prime Minister, by the admission of one of his own MPs, is taking a divide and conquer approach to Canadians. This reminds me of one of the very first promises from this bad Prime Minister, during my first federal election campaign. Those who were elected in 2015 will remember. He said he would run small deficits for two years in a row. Then, it would be even smaller, and then we would go back to a balanced budget before the end of his term. Nine years later, that promise is completely meaningless. The term “balanced budget” does not exist in this bad government's budgets.

Despite all of that, despite the end of their coalition, despite the bad government, despite all the noise coming from the NDP on September 4 when the orange coalition frog exploded, the NDP says it still has confidence in this government. The NDP is still going to vote for this bad Prime Minister to allow him to continue. “Continue” is the Prime Minister's favourite word. He is going to continue to hurt Canada a bit longer. NDP voters are going to remember that, but there is worse. The grand prize for deception goes to the Bloc Québécois.

● (1220)

I want to quote from a speech given on April 17 in the House after this bad Liberal government tabled its most recent budget. It reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that the Prime Minister is working hand in hand with Quebec. On the contrary, I believe he has his hand in Quebecers' pockets. He is blatantly abusing the fiscal imbalance. He is blatantly abusing his spending power. Furthermore, he is racking up an appalling deficit that Quebecers will be paying off for a long time to come simply to save his government's skin, and his own skin, in the next election.

That is the quite the condemnation of the last budget and of the Liberal Prime Minister. Who said that? Was it a Conservative? It sounds like something a Conservative might have said, but it was not a Conservative. It was the leader of the Bloc Québécois, the new political lieutenant for Quebec for this bad Prime Minister, who said that.

Business of Supply

Despite all of the Bloc Québécois's grandstanding and fancy speeches and all of the pompous speeches its leader gives everywhere, the Bloc is preparing to tell the Prime Minister that he does not have to worry, that the Bloc has confidence in him, even if he has a bad government, even if he has his hands in Quebecers' pockets and even if he is blatantly abusing the fiscal imbalance. That is clear. Even before the Bloc got anything from the government, it announced that it still appreciated the Liberal Prime Minister. The Bloc announced that it was going to vote in favour of this bad Prime Minister.

It is going to vote against the simple little motion I read out at the beginning, which says that the House has no confidence in this Prime Minister and the government. It is a simple motion. If the Bloc Québécois really wanted to walk the talk, it would vote with the Conservatives tomorrow. If they vote against a simple motion like this, it is because they like the Prime Minister. It is because they want this Prime Minister to stay in power time and again. In the words of the leader of the Bloc Québécois, "Quebeckers will be paying...for a long time to come simply to save his government's skin...in the next election".

Today, the leader of the "Liberal Bloc", the new coalition set to save the Prime Minister, is still talking out of both sides of his mouth to keep his place at the head of the parade by saying one thing and then the opposite in the same tweet. He announces his support for the Prime Minister while threatening to defeat him. Actions speak louder than words, and there is seldom any shortage of words when the leader of the Bloc Québécois takes the floor. The choice is clear. A vote for the motion is a vote to bring down a bad government. It is a vote to end federal Liberal interference in Quebec's jurisdictions and to restore hope to Quebeckers. A vote against the motion is a vote against Quebeckers, whose grocery bills have skyrocketed, who can no longer afford their mortgage payments, who no longer have access to housing, and who want the streets made safe again for their children.

I am often asked what the Conservatives have planned. It is simple and easy to remember. The next Conservative government's plan is to focus on Quebeckers and Canadians. What is the plan? A common-sense Conservative government will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. This needs to happen, and it needs to happen now, after nine years of this bad Liberal government.

We have to respect the Canadian voters and Quebec voters who elected a minority government. I say that because it is not said often enough. A minority government as bad as this one should not live to see another day. Again, I invite all parliamentarians who have doubts about the quality and competence of this Prime Minister to vote in favour of our motion and not to show more love for the Liberal Prime Minister by voting against the motion. It is time to give Canadians and Quebeckers a real choice and trigger an election to elect a common-sense Conservative government.

• (1225)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech this afternoon.

My question is very simple. Does my hon. colleague support the Leader of the Opposition's attacks on CBC/Radio-Canada and media organizations like CTV and on journalists?

Does my colleague support this attack on journalists and important organizations in Quebec and across the country?

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, at a minimum, I would have expected my Liberal colleague to acknowledge that it is unacceptable for a television journalist to take snippets of sentences and string them together to put words in the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition that he never uttered. Manipulating information the way CTV did is despicable and disgusting.

I cannot understand why Quebec's media has not spoken out against this situation yet. I cannot understand why my Liberal colleague did not denounce CTV for altering information under the very noses of Canadians and Quebeckers everywhere.

This way of doing things is unacceptable, and we will always condemn such downright despicable actions in every corner of the public sphere.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member's speech really fixated on the Bloc Québécois. I appreciate the love. Some people say that love and hate are closely related. When someone puts a lot of passion into something, it always ends up coming back to where it started, like circling a globe, so it is appreciated and the feeling is mutual.

Now, it is always amusing that it is up to us, the separatists, to explain the British parliamentary traditions in Canada. Parliament is the master of everything, regardless of the captain's political stripe. As our colleague just pointed out, any time a minority government is elected—and this government just became a minority again—when a parliamentarian is in opposition, they get on board and play the game, even though I personally do not believe that the Canadian parliamentary system is a good one. However, that is what we have right now, so we are using it to make any gains we can. That is what it means to take the opposition role seriously and constructively.

Now, I imagine that my colleague will not answer my question, but as the official opposition for the past nine years, what have the Conservatives gained?

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, this is all a game. Did you hear what my Bloc Québécois colleague just said? This is a game. While rent prices have doubled, while we are facing inflation the likes of which we have not seen in 40 years, while young families no longer have access to housing, while young families can no longer even dream of becoming homeowners, while, by the admission of the Bloc Québécois leader himself, "Quebeckers will be paying...for a long time to come simply to save his government's skin...in the next election", the Bloc Québécois is just thinking about games.

We are thinking about Quebeckers, and we want to put an end to this bad Liberal government.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased we have this moment to come together to vote non-confidence in the Conservative leader yet again. I do not want to say I do not respect him. He is living in his 19-room mansion with his own private chef, and he thinks we need to get this election happening right away. I am wondering what he is so worried about.

Then I read Erin O'Toole's statements that Erin O'Toole was taken down by foreign interference by the Chinese Communist Party. Who was put in place? It is the guy now living in the 19-room mansion, the only leader in Canadian history who has never obtained a security clearance. Is it that he cannot get the security clearance? What are my hon. colleagues trying to hide over there? They all supported the member, who obviously did well from the Chinese interference that took down a credible leader like Erin O'Toole.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I would ask my NDP colleague the same question. What is he trying to hide?

We are here to talk about a non-confidence motion against this government and to say that the House does not have confidence in this bad Liberal government. What I am hearing from my NDP colleague is a whole different story.

I understand where he is coming from. Earlier, I was talking about the little orange frog. If I were a member of the NDP caucus, I too would also be ashamed of the nine years of this Liberal government. I would be ashamed of having supported this bad Prime Minister. I would be ashamed of the fact that, because of our actions, millions of Canadians now have to turn to food banks, the cost of housing has doubled, food is getting more and more expensive and people can no longer afford groceries.

- (1230)

[English]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Prime Minister and the Liberal government, our country is broken. Canadians are struggling more than they have in decades. Our communities, our provinces and our cities look like war zones. We have a Prime Minister who has lost his way.

Today, we have more Canadians who are facing homelessness, more Canadians who cannot afford to feed their children and more Canadians accessing food banks than ever before. What does the Prime Minister do? He takes to the U.S. airwaves to deliver his message. Why? He is afraid to stand before Canadians and answer the tough questions. Once again, he runs and takes to the U.S. airwaves that pander to him and he answers lob questions.

We are all here to deliver for our constituents. There are 338 members of Parliament who have been elected to be the voices of Canadians. The House is a House of Commons for the common people. The carpet is green for the common people. We said before, early on in the Prime Minister's tenure, that if the carpet was red or if there was a red carpet going up to his seat, maybe he would appear here more often than he has. Maybe he would take it more seriously.

What I am hearing on the doorsteps, and not just in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George but all across this country, is that Canadians have lost confidence in the government and in the Prime Minister. The Liberal government has given up on Canadians. It has failed Canadians.

I received a call from Tina, a constituent of mine from Horsefly, B.C., just yesterday. She is a disabled indigenous childhood trauma survivor who said, "When the Liberals stand in the House of Commons and claim they are helping the most vulnerable Canadians, they are lying. I am being impoverished by the NDP and Liberals—"

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We do not even know if this person he is quoting exists, but he is using that voice in order to use unparliamentary language. It is unacceptable. He needs to withdraw and apologize.

The Deputy Speaker: I would suggest that all of us have to be cognizant of the words we are using, even when we are quoting, and to try to stay away from unparliamentary words as much as possible. Maybe I can ask the hon. member to rephrase and continue. I understand it is a quote, but we cannot use derogatory names. We cannot use words that are seen as unparliamentary in this chamber.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, Tina went on to say, "I am being impoverished by the NDP and Liberals. I can call and order MAID as a disabled person before I am deemed worthy of being able to afford to live."

I rise today in the chamber to declare what millions of Canadians already know to be true: The Liberal government, led by the Prime Minister, has failed our country. The Prime Minister has failed the Canadian people. He has failed to uphold the trust that was placed upon him, not once, not twice, but three times. After nine long years of broken promises, skyrocketing costs, crumbling institutions and countless scandals, it is now crystal clear that the Liberal government no longer commands the confidence of the Canadian people, nor should it command the confidence of the House.

Let us be clear: Our country is broken. This is not just the rhetoric of the opposition; it is a fact evident in the daily lives of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Nine years ago, the Prime Minister promised us "sunny ways". He promised to uplift the middle class, make life more affordable and restore confidence in government.

However, after almost a decade, what do we have to show for it? We have a country where everything is more expensive, where families struggle to afford the most basic necessities, where crime is surging, where overdoses are claiming thousands of lives, where mental health is at its worst level ever, where hope for the future is dwindling and where overdose is the leading cause of death for youth aged 12 to 18 in my province of British Columbia. That is the record of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister and the Liberal government are to blame for this.

Business of Supply

Let us begin by talking about the cost of living, which has spiralled out of control under the Liberal government's watch. Under the Prime Minister's leadership, the dream of home ownership has slipped away from millions of young Canadians. In 2015, the average price of a home in Canada was just under \$440,000. Today that price has ballooned to over \$750,000, a staggering 66% increase. In cities like Vancouver and Toronto, the numbers are even more horrifying.

How are young families supposed to save for a down payment when prices soar at this rate? Consequently, a staggering two-thirds of young Canadians believe they will never be able to afford a home. Rent has doubled. The needed down payment has doubled. Home prices have doubled.

Not only that, but homeless encampments are springing up all across our country by the hundreds. There are 1,800 homeless encampments in this province alone. In my province, rest areas along the highway are becoming encampments with RVs and trailers because people cannot afford to buy a home and cannot afford to pay rent. That is the stark reality. That is the record under the Prime Minister.

It is not just housing. Let us talk about groceries. Food prices have increased by almost 10% over the past year alone, and 20% of Canadians, two million Canadians, accessed a food bank just last month. That is staggering. The average family of four now spends over \$15,000 per year just to put food on the table. What has the Liberal government done? It has dismissed these hardships with platitudes while ordinary Canadians are forced to make impossible decisions between feeding their families and paying their bills. Liberals said that Canadians have never had it so good.

The Prime Minister has printed money like it is his job, recklessly adding more to the national debt than all other prime ministers in the history of our country combined.

The cost of gas has shot through the roof, with prices reaching over \$2 per litre in some provinces this year alone. Families are paying more at the pumps. Truckers are paying more to deliver goods.

We know that if they tax the farmer that produces the food and tax the trucker that ships the food, it is Canadians that pay the price for that food. What is the Liberal response to this? They will raise the taxes. They will move to quadruple their carbon tax to 61¢ per litre, punishing hard-working Canadians even further.

Our communities look like war zones. I ask Canadians who are watching this from the gallery today and at home to take a look at their neighbourhoods and their communities. Do they look the way they did nine years ago? No, they do not. Crime is up. Overdoses are up. The failures of the current government go far beyond economics. Under the Prime Minister and his Liberal government, our communities have become less safe. Crime is on the rise in every part of this country. Violent crime has increased by 50% since the Prime Minister took office in 2015.

• (1235)

Violent gun crime is up by 116%. Murders are up 28%. Gang-related murders are up 78%. Sexual assaults are up 75%. Auto theft

is up 46%, and extortion is up a whopping 357%. The streets of our cities, once safe and welcoming, now bear the scars of neglect with spikes in gang violence, drug-related crimes and random assaults. The Prime Minister's solution to this is a hug-a-thug, catch-and-release, soft-on-crime, revolving-door justice system that benefits the criminals at the expense of Canadians' safety.

Now I will move on to a topic that is near and dear to me. Since 2016, over 47,000 Canadians have lost their life to overdose. The government has spent over a billion dollars on failed drug policies. When I think about this, I think about Mr. Charles and Mrs. MacDonald, whose daughter Brianna, aged just 13, died in a homeless encampment due to overdose just last month. I think about my own brother, who is on the street, gripped in this crisis. We can perpetuate somebody's addiction but we cannot get them into treatment.

That is the failed record of the Prime Minister. I have spent nine minutes speaking about the Liberals' failed record. I have not even touched on the scandals and the corruption the Prime Minister has brought to the House. We are the laughingstock on the international stage. The Prime Minister wants to be known more for his socks than for the work he does here at home.

The Prime Minister kicked to the curb the first indigenous female Attorney General because she spoke truth to power and would not back his corrupt ways.

I will leave the House with this: We can do better. The time for change is now. We can no longer allow the government to stumble from scandal to scandal, leaving Canadians to pick up the pieces. Taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up, and time is up for the Prime Minister.

• (1240)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member started his speech by saying that Canada is broken. I disagree.

The Conservatives are good at bumper stickers and they are great at slogans, as clearly demonstrated by members opposite, but I can assure members opposite that Canada is not broken. All one needs to do is travel to any region of the country and they will see individuals who are very proud to call themselves Canadians and an economy that is doing relatively well in comparison to that of any other country in the world.

However, the Conservatives consistently go around and mislead people, whether it is by making the derogatory statement that Canada is broken, when we know it is not, or the many different types of disinformation they continuously pump out to please the far "MAGA" right.

Business of Supply

When will the Conservatives start being honest with Canadians and recognize Canada for what it is: the best country in the world to call home?

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, Canada is the best country in the world; I absolutely agree with the member.

Unfortunately, under the Liberal government and the Prime Minister, over two million Canadians access a food bank every month. There are more homeless Canadians, more people losing the hope and the dream of home ownership, more Canadians out of work and more overdoses. That is the record. There are 47,000 Canadians who have lost their life to overdose since 2016. That is the record of the current government.

Only a Liberal will stand up and tell us that Canadians have never had it so good. Only a Liberal will stand up and say, “You ain’t seen nothing here.”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speech given by my colleague from Cariboo—Prince George, I was surprised that I did not hear him talk about the Conservatives’ priorities. Members will recall that today’s motion is very simple. It talks about confidence.

Personally, one of the reasons I do not trust this government is because of its action, and especially its lack of action, on the current climate crisis, particularly when we see it giving oil companies \$83 billion in tax giveaways and investing \$34 billion in the acquisition and construction of the Trans Mountain pipeline. If the Minister of Environment and Climate Change wanted to do something for the environment and to save the planet, I think that an order on the member for Cariboo—Prince George might be appropriate, but we are not there yet. We need strong environmental measures if we want to move forward.

I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[*English*]

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I find it a little rich that our colleague from the Bloc will stand here and talk about the environment, when his province, in partnership with the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister, dumped billions of litres of raw sewage into rivers. Perhaps the member should ask the Prime Minister’s new Quebec lieutenant, the leader of the Bloc Party, if he was allowed to say that.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague’s comments, particularly his faith that we still have the best country in the world, which we are going to turn around.

I would ask the member what metrics he would like to show us that show, in the nine years the government has been in power, how much crime has risen, how much unemployment has risen, how much the economy has gone down in Canada, how much further every measure that we count on here to make a great country has to go down before we are actually going to be below the standard, and what our response should be as politicians in the House to respond to the concerns of Canadians who see those results.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, two million Canadians are using a food bank. More Canadians are facing homelessness. We know that more Canadians are about \$200 away from being bankrupt at the end of every month. Murders are up 28%. Gang-related murders are up 78%. Assaults are up 75%. Violent crime is up 50% since the Prime Minister came to power.

I will end with, again, the fact that over 47,000 Canadians have lost their lives due to overdose. What is the Prime Minister’s response to that? It is to give them more free drugs, enable them, not get them into recovery and not do everything in our power to bring our loved ones home safe and sound. The Prime Minister will have us believe that everything is fine, everything is rosy, but the reality is that Canadians have suffered more in the last nine years than ever before.

• (1245)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that I will be splitting my time this afternoon with the member for Winnipeg North. I look forward to his remarks as well.

Today we have a motion from the opposition on non-confidence in the Prime Minister and the government. Although it is not binding, of course, the convention would be that, if a majority of members of Parliament voted in favour, it would trigger an election.

I will be very clear that I will be voting against this motion. It gives me an opportunity to talk about why I have confidence in the Prime Minister and the government, as well as an opportunity to opine a bit on what I have observed through five years sitting in this House with the member for Carleton. It is very clear that the members of the Conservative Party want an election right now. I look forward to digging into the rationale and some of the concerns that I would have, in contrasting our approach to theirs. That is where I am going to start, because if Conservatives are hell-bent on an election, it is important for Canadians to understand the different approaches that we would take as political parties and as members of Parliament.

As I have sat in this House and listened over the last couple of hours of this debate, particularly to the member for Cariboo—Prince George, who was just up, there is no nuance to the positions. It is simply all-in that this is to be true, with very few statistics to back it up. The member quoted some statistics, some of which have no or very little correlation to the Prime Minister or the Government of Canada with respect to even its jurisdiction to govern these issues. This is the reality. It is more of an emotional appeal than a rational appeal. Therefore, I look forward to trying to explain some of where I stand on this as a member of Parliament.

Business of Supply

I want to start with the economy. Conservatives will often stand up, as an opposition in this place, and talk about the economy. They will talk about some of the affordability challenges out there which, by the way, are very real. The government has acknowledged that and I think many members of Parliament have acknowledged that, as well as the initiatives we can take on as parliamentarians to support Canadians who are going through a difficult time. However, Conservatives never talk about Canada in comparison to other countries in the world of comparable fashion. They never talk about Canadian successes. Yes, it is their job to oppose, but if they want to keep some level of credibility in this place, we would think that they would be able to contrast some of the things that are happening in the country that are good and some of the things that are challenging that they want to see the government work on harder.

Here are a few facts and statistics. As it relates to interest cuts, around the world we have seen central banks raise interest rates as a result of the inflation that is being felt around the world. We would not know that when we hear from the members of the official opposition, who would suggest that it is only in Canada that inflation exists. That is simply not the case. Canada is actually leading the G7 in relation to interest rate cuts. That is as a direct result of the fact that the government has laid out a fiscal plan that it intends to maintain with respect to balancing investments that matter for Canadians, but at the same time making sure that there is a credible path to a declining debt-to-GDP ratio over time. We never hear that from the opposition benches.

We are actually expected to be second in overall economic growth on a GDP basis in the G7 in 2024, and leading in the G7 in 2025. We would not find that in the Hansard from the official opposition whatsoever, but those are the statistics that are being projected in the days ahead. We have been second in overall cumulative economic growth in the G7 since 2015. If we listen to the opposition, who would suggest that the country is broken, nothing good is happening and there have been no successes, how do they contend with that fact? How do they contend with the fact that we have had the second-highest GDP growth of all G7 comparative countries? That is a reality. That is a fact. It is a statistic, not an emotion. It is not a feeling; it is real.

I will grant, and I have been critical in this House, including against the government caucus that I sit in, that productivity is an issue and that we have to focus on that, but it is something the government has acknowledged in its own remarks and presentations. Yes, there is more work to be done.

With respect to this idea that the country is broken, that nothing good has happened and what have we seen in nine years, we have the second-highest GDP growth in the G7. That would be my response to the member for Cariboo—Prince George. Inflation is back down to 2%. That is a really important thing. We know that when inflation is high, it has an impact on everyday, working Canadians.

What I want to highlight, because I hear it in my riding, and I am sympathetic to the challenges that are there, is this. People are saying that inflation is back down, but their wages have not gone up. In some cases, I am sure that is true, there are some Canadians who may not have seen a pay increase in their particular circumstances, but when we look at the totality of the Canadian economy, for the

last 18 months we have seen wage growth in this country outpace inflation. We have seen that Canada is leading the G7 on wage growth relative to inflation from the fourth quarter of 2019 to now. We would never hear the opposition talk about that.

• (1250)

Again, I am not trying to negate the fact that there are challenges out there; there are. However, we have to have a bit of reality in this place and try to find some balance about what we should be doing and how we should be presenting to Canadians. I do not stand here to suggest that everything is perfect, but I stand here in contrast to the official opposition, who want to burn it down, with every speech sounding very similar in its outlook. The Conservatives' message discipline is great. I wonder who is writing those speeches, because it does not seem like it is an authentic message coming from the opposition benches.

How about foreign direct investment? There was the third-highest amount of foreign direct investment in this country of all countries, in 2023, whether that is Michelin in Nova Scotia, BHP in Saskatchewan or maybe Volkswagen in Ontario, and I could go on. There are good things happening in this country because the government is laying the foundation to draw in generational investment that is going to matter for Canadian jobs, today and in the years ahead. Conservatives do not recognize those positions.

Let us talk about debt position. We heard the member for Cariboo—Prince George talk about a debt and the fact that it has accumulated under the current Prime Minister. The member failed to mention that we had a pandemic that was a once-in-100-years event that required the government to step in and support Canadians. If the member for Carleton had his way, those big fat government programs that supported Canadians at the height of their need would not have been available. Where would we have been on the economic recovery, had the Conservatives actually been in power? I suggest they would not have stepped up for small business owners and individuals who were being impacted at the most uncertain time in the last 100 years as it relates to global health. The Conservatives do not acknowledge that whatsoever.

Let us talk about the environment. This matters to Canadians. We are seeing it. Mr. Speaker, you are from Nova Scotia. We have seen extreme weather over the last couple of summers in our own constituencies. This is a reality. This is on the ground. We are dealing with this today. This is perhaps where there is the most contrast between the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. At the end of the day, we are the only government in Canadian history that has actually reduced emissions and grown the economy at the same time. The Conservatives have slogans. They have very little as it relates to an actual environmental plan. That is getting fleshed out every day here in the House of Commons.

Business of Supply

Let me speak about affordability, health and housing. There are the Canada child benefit, the national child care program and dental care for seniors, which the Conservatives are noncommittal about keeping for my seniors and your seniors in West Nova, Mr. Speaker. How about pharmacare? There is no commitment regarding where the Conservatives stand on that. We have had challenges with respect to housing. Three levels of government are responsible. Successive federal governments got out of the business of housing and we are trying to get back in and support it. In 2023, we had the most housing starts in Nova Scotia since 1940. That is a direct result of this government's investment and support and initiatives.

How about increases for seniors? We have actually been there to help support seniors in their need. I will remind my opposition colleagues that the Conservatives actually would have proposed to move the age of eligibility for seniors up to 67 before they even got their entitlement from the OAS. The Conservatives announced that at the World Economic Forum. I know the Conservatives like to play into this idea that the World Economic Forum has taken over the world. It was the Conservatives' prime minister who went there and announced that initiative, back in the day.

Last, I want to talk about the member for Carleton because he is the leader of the official opposition. He is the one who wants to call an election and wants to be prime minister. What is concerning is that I came over here to the House and I heard the leader of the official opposition using the word “cronies” with regard to the idea that people were gouging and making personal attacks of CEOs on the floor of the House of Commons. Other members of Parliament might have a view as it relates to Bell Canada and whether it is a good thing for Canada. However, when someone stands in the House of Commons, wants to be the prime minister of this country and makes personal attacks from that vantage point, they call into question a company that employs thousands of hard-working Canadians. Then, they attack the journalists. It is not just CTV; my God, it is CBC. Is there any media outlet that the leader of the official opposition actually will not attack? He attacks experts.

However, because I have watched the Leader of the Opposition for five years, I will say this to the House. It is concerning when we throw rocks when we live in a glass house. The member for Timmins—James Bay has gone on at great length about the fact that the member for Carleton lives 30 minutes outside of the House of Commons at Stornoway, costing hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars. The Leader of the Opposition then calls into question the leader of the NDP with respect to why that individual serves Canadians in Parliament, supposedly around a pension, when that guy, the Leader of the Opposition, has not worked a day in his life outside of this place and collected a pension at 31. I think that is the most hypocritical position I have seen in the House of Commons.

• (1255)

Mr. Scot Davidson (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my hon. colleague could comment on rural Canadians being disproportionately affected by the carbon tax. He especially knows about standing up for constituents, such as my constituents in York—Simcoe, who have been classified by the government as part of Toronto. He knows that I represent the soup and salad bowl. He knows that the government is now dividing Canadians based on ge-

ography with that tax and how that tax is so unfair for my residents and farmers right across Canada, not getting Bill C-234 done.

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to carbon pricing, I have actually taken this government to task, to adjust the national program in the interest of supporting rural Canadians, but let me be very clear. I do support the government's environmental agenda. When I look across to the opposition, I do not see much of an environmental agenda whatsoever.

I take notice of the hon. member opposite. Yes, he has rightfully fought to try to make sure there are further adjustments and refinements to the national program to make sure his constituents, who I think are demonstrably rural, are supportive. However, let us not mistake the facts on a couple of things. This government does have an environmental agenda that matters. It has actually grown the economy while reducing emissions at the same time. As it relates to Bill C-234, he should walk across and talk to the member for Huron—Bruce about when he is going to let it be called to a vote. Our farmers in this country deserve Bill C-234 to be passed but the Conservatives are standing in the way of letting it be called to a vote. We need to have that vote sooner rather than later.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the clarifications my colleague just made.

He talked a lot about rural areas. I know that his riding is rural and that supply-managed production is important there. He knows as well as I do that Bill C-282 was passed in the House in June 2023, as hon. members will recall. It is now September 2024. It has been languishing in the Senate for over a year, gathering dust.

I would like to know if he and his caucus have talked about how his Prime Minister could potentially intervene. Are calls being made to senators to tell them that the government voted in favour of this bill, that it officially supports the bill, that the government wants it finished up, that it might allow the Liberals to stay in office a little longer if Quebec gets this win?

Can my colleague answer that? Time is of the essence.

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, my riding of Kings—Hants includes a large number of supply-managed farms. That is very important to Nova Scotia, of course, but also to Quebec and all of Canada.

I support Bill C-282 and so does the government. The Senate is independent. I think a conversation with senators on the importance of this bill is, indeed, necessary.

I also have some concerns about the Conservatives' position on this and their support for the supply-managed sector. The reality is that they voted against protecting supply management. This is a major concern for the people in our ridings, especially among farmers.

Business of Supply

● (1300)

[English]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned a number of programs. He mentioned child care. I have to say that it has impacted my extended family directly. My daughter finally got a good child care position for my granddaughter that has really brought stability and removed stress from their lives. He mentioned pharmacare. He suggested that the Conservatives have not signalled what they think about that. The Leader of the Opposition made it very clear that he did not like pharmacare for Canadians. We have done so much over the last couple of years, with the NDP forcing the Liberals to do things that they had voted against, such as dental care, pharmacare and anti-scab legislation for workers.

I am just wondering if he can tell me why anyone in the House or anyone in this country should have confidence in the Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Party.

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I worry about the position of the leader of the official opposition: the way he attacks journalists, the way he attacks experts, and the way he runs down Canadian companies and does so from the floor of the House of Commons. He has an agenda. He has been a member of Parliament for 20 years without working outside this place. His record is very clear. I look forward to sharing what this guy actually stands for with Canadians, along with my hon. colleague.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the particular motion we are debating today in fact reflects the leadership of the Conservative Party. I should say the “Conservative-Reform party”. That far-right influence continues to dictate the type of policy directives that we see. It does kind of seep out at times from the Conservative Party today. As I listen to members, I would like them to reflect on what we are actually voting on.

The Conservatives say it is a motion of confidence in the government. I would put the question in a different way. I would suggest that this is a question of confidence in the leader of the Conservative Party, who has one mission and one mission only, and it is driven by a thirst for power. He is not concerned about what is taking place in our communities in all the different regions of the country. He is not concerned about issues of inflation or affordability. He has the slogans, and he has the bumper stickers ready. His only focus is that thirst for power.

At the very first opportunity he gets, he brings in a motion of non-confidence. We are in to debate now for five or six days, and they have already brought in four days on which we debated concurrence motions, instead of having a debate on government and private members' legislation that could, in fact, be passing. I am thinking of the military to civil courts legislation that the Conservatives support, but they continue to filibuster it. They have a constant attitude of trying to play the role of a destructive force on the floor of the House of Commons. They are prepared to put their self-interest ahead of the interests of Canadians.

I hope that when we see the ultimate vote on today's motion, they will take the time to reflect that it is time to cool down on their

thirst for power and start putting more of a focus on what is in the best interest of Canadians.

I listened to the leader of the Conservative Party's personal attack on CTV and how disgraceful it was. We are used to CBC. We have three national television networks, and because he does not like the factual information that is going out on them, he takes the opportunity here on the floor of the House of Commons to attack them. It does not surprise me, because I suspect that there has never been a leader of any national political party that has been as intentionally misleading as this leader has on many different fronts.

We just started the session back up for the fall. Caucus meetings took place in all the political parties. I will quote an interesting headline that came out in regard to the Conservative caucus: “Carbon pricing to cause economic ‘nuclear winter’”. So says the leader of the Conservative Party.

Get this, Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about something that is so ridiculous, it is a joke. The leader of the Conservative Party actually said that to the Conservative members of Parliament when they convened to have their power meeting. Here is what an article had to say:

...the Liberal government's plans to increase the [carbon] price would cause a “nuclear winter” for the economy.

“There would be mass hunger and malnutrition with a tax this high...our seniors would have to turn the heat down to 14 or 13 C just to make it through the [winter]”....

He went on to say:

“Inflation would run rampant and people would not be able to leave their homes or drive anywhere.”

This is what the Conservative brain trust had to say to the Conservative members of Parliament. There is no doubt that he likely got applause. We can think about how ridiculous a statement that is.

● (1305)

It is almost as bad as the leader of the Conservative Party and members of the Conservative Party travelling everywhere in Canada and trying to give the false impression that Canada is broken. The only thing that is broken in Canada is the Conservative-Reform party of Canada. They need to re-evaluate where they are getting their ideas from. What about their performance and personal attacks? I just finished sharing some thoughts in regard to the leader of the Conservative Party. These thoughts are mild compared to the attitudes that the Conservative Party took against the current Prime Minister, even before he was prime minister.

I say, we can look at the results and at the things the government has actually been able to achieve. In his speech, the leader of the Conservative Party said that they are going to be there for health care. That is balderdash. The Liberal government brought in our health care system, and people such as Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin preserved it.

Business of Supply

Just an hour or so ago, the leader of the Conservative Party said that Conservatives delivered on health care and provided the money. That is garbage. It was a Paul Martin agreement with the health accord that saw a 6% increase for provinces in health care transfers. That is what delivered the health care increases. It had nothing to do with Stephen Harper. In fact, when those agreements expired, what was the first thing Harper did? He decreased them. That is the reality.

What does the current government do? No government in the last 60 years has committed as many dollars to public health care as this one has, including \$198 billion over 10 years. What are the Conservatives going to do about that? They are trying to say they care about health care, but their attitude towards health care is to get rid of it. We see that in their actions and the words they often use. They do not believe the federal government needs to play that role. Will they, in fact, enforce such things as the Canada Health Act? We can look at their response to pharmacare: The leader of the Conservative Party mocked the government for pursuing a national pharmacare program.

I have news for members opposite. The original idea or plan for the health care system was to have a pharmacare program, to ensure that there was more financial accountability and to ensure that we had things like the Canada Health Act. I remind the Conservatives of this: They can campaign against health care all they want, but a vast majority of Canadians care deeply and passionately about our health care system. The leader of the Conservative Party is way off base on that issue.

I had a tough time listening when the leader of the Conservative Party was glorifying Stephen Harper. He said that immigration policy was wonderful under Stephen Harper and that he would do what he could to emulate it.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, members opposite say “it was” and nod their heads in affirmation. Do they not realize that Stephen Harper actually cancelled, not delayed or postponed, but cancelled the sponsoring of parents and grandparents? It took years for someone's spouse to be able to come to Canada under the Harper regime. Immigration was a disaster in many ways under Stephen Harper, yet the leader of the Conservative Party glorifies it.

I could not believe it when the leader of the Conservative Party talked about housing. He was the minister of housing, but how many houses did he build? A person barely needs two hands to count them. He built six. That is it. If he were a decent minister of housing, we might not have issues to the degree we have them today. If there was a government that did not believe in a national presence on the housing file, it was Stephen Harper's, with the file led by the current leader of the Conservative Party. I cannot imagine how the Conservatives could try to say that they would be able to deal with the housing issue in Canada over what the Liberal government has done. We have invested more and worked more with other levels of government in order to deal with the important issues than has been done in generations. That applies not only to housing but also to a wide spectrum of issues in which the quality of life is improving in all regions of our country.

• (1310)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): There is so much to unpack in that tirade, Mr. Speaker.

I want to remind my hon. colleague across the way that it was the Liberals, under Paul Martin and Jean Chrétien, who cut the health care transfers by 50%. That is part of the reason the Conservative government struggled and increased health care transfers by 3% every year. It invested in health care as no other previous government had.

My colleague talked about the Conservative leader attacking CTV. What CTV did yesterday was to take bits and pieces, excerpts of our leader's statements, and falsely splice them together into one statement. It is a matter of truth and a matter of record. That is what CTV did. It has apologized for it.

Why is my hon. colleague across the way misleading Canadians with that statement?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to name another leader who has been as critical of our national media, and maybe I will reconsider some of the comments I made regarding the Conservative leader's attitude toward national media. I can advise him that he will not find one.

With regard to the health care issue, the member is wrong. It was actually Jean Chrétien who ensured ongoing cash transfers to the different provinces because of the tax point changes that were made in previous decades. That marginalized the amount of money flowing to the provinces. It was then Paul Martin who instituted the 6% agreement to ensure that we would have the health care dollars that are flowing today. The current government has invested almost \$200 billion over the next 10 years.

It is part of the Conservative Party's hidden agenda. We cannot trust Conservatives when it comes to health care; I can assure the member of that. The Liberals brought in health care, and the Liberals are going to ensure that it is there for future generations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is almost painful to hear the desperate indignation of my colleague across the way. It reminds me of act 5 of *Richard III*, when he says, “A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!”

Nevertheless, historically, when Donald Trump was elected in the United States, people said that it made no sense. The thing to remember, however, is that Barack Obama's poor performance is what led Donald Trump to power. The one emboldened the other.

How much responsibility is the Liberal Party willing to accept for the Conservatives' apparent success these days?

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to concede to the Conservative Party. That is for a simple reason: I truly believe that the more people get to know who the leader of the Conservative Party is, the more they will turn away from the Conservative Party. It is a question of being able to communicate messages. We got a bit of a sense of that when the leader of the Conservative Party attacked our national networks. It is not just CTV. It is also CBC and other news agencies.

Unless it is something like Rebel News or social media, the Conservatives are always offside because they do not want Canadians to know the hidden Conservative agenda or the personality of the leader of the Conservative Party.

● (1315)

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to build on the leader of the Conservative Party's constant attack against freedom of the press in this fake freedom crusade of the Conservatives. They have spent most of their time protecting freedom of speech for people who have been accused of hate speech.

I will give an example: Jordan Peterson had his licence as an Ontario psychologist taken away by the governing body because of hate that he was spreading on social media. He fought in court against having to take training because of the harm he was causing as a psychologist; he lost in the Supreme Court. He does not support freedom of speech; he supports hate speech and going against reputable networks in favour of think tanks, such as Frontier, that are on the record for residential school denialism.

Could my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North build on that?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have amplified, or at least attempted to amplify, the fact that the leader of the Conservative Party is very much part of the far-right movement that seeps up from the United States into Canada, and he is lapping it up. He loves this stuff, and he espouses it. Part of that is attacking mainstream media in favour of feeding that extreme right. The amount of misinformation that flows through the Conservative caucus, in particular the leader of the Conservative Party, is truly amazing, and, unfortunately, it continues to grow.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member of Parliament for Calgary Forest Lawn.

Canadians are desperate. They are desperate for a new government. That is because after nine years of the Prime Minister, life has never been harder for Canadians. His failed policies, propped up by the NDP at every opportunity, have doubled the debt, doubled housing costs, caused the worst inflation in 40 years, sent a record number of Canadians to food banks and unleashed crime and chaos in our communities.

Canadians deserve better. They should be able to come home from work with a paycheque that puts a roof over their heads and food on their tables. However, that is not the reality for far too many Canadians.

The Prime Minister's cost of living crisis has become so severe that even working Canadians have to depend on food banks or are skipping meals just to get by. In a single month last year, food banks had a record two million visits. Year over year, the Prime Minister's inflation and taxes have caused grocery prices to surge. The average Canadian family will pay \$700 more above and beyond the high prices they paid last year.

The Prime Minister's plan to quadruple his punishing carbon tax is only going to make things worse. In the midst of an ongoing affordability crisis in our country, the Prime Minister hiked taxes again on groceries, he ignored Canadians who are begging for relief and he turned a deaf ear to premiers across the country.

Despite the NDP leader's recent claim that he opposed the carbon tax because of the burden it places on workers, Canadians know that the Prime Minister hiked the carbon tax with the enthusiastic support of his NDP partner. In fact, NDP members voted for the carbon tax at least 24 times in this place. They are every bit as responsible as the Prime Minister for adding to the cost of fuel, groceries, home heating and just about every necessity that Canadians need.

The NDP-Liberal carbon tax is punishing Canadians for going to work, taxing moms and dads for driving their kids to hockey or to dance classes, penalizing the seniors who are on fixed incomes for eating a nutritious meal and diving deep into the pockets of Canadians for simply trying to stay warm in the winter. Punishing Canadians for life's basic necessities is cruel and it does nothing to safeguard the environment.

The costly carbon tax is even more punishing in my province of Saskatchewan. When people live in a rural or small community, public transit simply is not an option. They simply have to drive further distances to get to work or to simply go to school. The reality is that people are going to drive a little further to get groceries or prescriptions, never mind a doctor or specialist appointment that could literally be hours away. When temperatures dip to -50C, heat is not a luxury; it is a necessity. That is the lived experience in Saskatchewan and for so many rural Canadians across the country. It is a reality that the government conveniently ignores time and time again.

Just like how the Liberal-NDP government pretends that Canadians are somehow better off because of its punishing carbon tax, it conveniently ignores all the evidence around it, including reports from the independent Parliamentary Budget Office. In fact, we learned last spring that the government hid its own reports to that effect.

Business of Supply

The PBO has been clear that most families will pay more in carbon tax than they get back in rebates. This year, families in Saskatchewan will pay, on average, \$2,618 in carbon taxes alone. That is money better spent on their own families' priorities and needs.

• (1320)

Let us not forget about our farmers, who are paying massive carbon tax bills. By 2030, Canadian farmers are expected to pay \$1 billion in carbon taxes on the propane and natural gas they use to heat and cool their barns, greenhouses and grain-drying operations. Never mind the carbon tax costs that are added to every purchase they make for their farm operations.

Farmers are leaders in sustainability and they deserve relief. The Prime Minister is dead set on getting those dollars from our farmers, using his Liberal-appointed Senators to gut Bill C-234, a Conservative bill that would have offered carbon tax relief for our farmers.

Shamefully, the Prime Minister is willing to jeopardize the viability of farm businesses and food security in our country just to drive home his own activist-driven agenda and pay for his own reckless spending. Farmers in my riding have had enough. They want a government that does not punish them for their hard work. They just want to earn an honest living and grow safe, delicious, nutritious food for Canada and for the world.

Fortunately, there is hope on the horizon. A Conservative government will restore common sense in Ottawa. The Conservatives have a plan to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. We will bring down inflation with a dollar in savings for every new dollar spent. We will cut the carbon tax that is adding to the cost of everything for Canadians. The Conservatives will bring home lower prices so that Canadians can reap the rewards of their hard work. We will remove the gatekeepers who have slowed housing construction. We will create well-paying jobs for Canadians by green-lighting energy projects at home instead of driving away production into the hands of dirty dictators.

The Conservatives will take meaningful action to address the crime and the chaos that have become far too commonplace in communities across the country. We will do that by dismantling the Prime Minister's catch-and-release system that is endangering the lives of Canadians. We will also end the Prime Minister's dangerous drug experiment that is flooding our streets with taxpayer-funded hard drugs. Instead, we will invest in treatment and recovery so that Canadians can bring their loved ones home drug-free.

After nine years of the Prime Minister, Canadians are desperate. They are so desperate for much-needed relief. What Canadians do not need are media stunts from the NDP leader.

The NDP leader told Canadians that he was tearing up his coalition agreement with the Liberal government. He told Canadians that the deal was done, that the Prime Minister did not deserve to govern. Now that the votes have been counted in that Winnipeg by-election, and there is a simple motion in front of the House, the NDP leader has conveniently changed his tune.

The motion we are debating today is very straightforward, "That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government." If the NDP leader were sincere in his declarations to Canadians, there should be no question. However, what Canadians are once again learning is that NDP members are not focused on what is best for Canadians. They are focused on their own interests and protecting their own pensions. Despite their desperation to try to distance themselves from the terrible record of the Prime Minister, which, to be clear, is equally their own record, having voted hand in hand with the Liberal government for its failed policies and activist-driven agenda, the NDP is once again failing to be the opposition party that it was elected to be. It must be arts-and-crafts time as it is too busy taping up that coalition agreement that the NDP leader ripped up.

Across the country, Canadians are begging for relief. It is time for the Bloc and the NDP to stop protecting the costly Prime Minister who is hurting Canadians. Enough is enough, and time is up for the Prime Minister. The NDP and Bloc need to join Conservatives and give Canadians the carbon tax election that they so desperately need.

• (1325)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every member of Parliament is entitled to his or her own view in this place, but I did not hear anything about the fact that Canada is expected to lead the G7 in economic growth next year. I did not hear anything about BHP's investment in her home province of Saskatchewan and how that is a good thing. I did not hear much about Canada's best deficit position in the G7 or the fact that wage growth has outpaced inflation for the last 18 months. There are challenges, undoubtedly, but there are some good things happening, although we would never know that from the opposition.

I do want to ask this on agriculture, because she has a lot of grain farmers in Saskatchewan. Bill C-234 is before the House. It has not been called to a vote because consecutive Conservative members have continued to get up and speak without letting it be called to a vote. There is a majority in the House allowing for the grain provisions on grain drying to pass. Will that member commit to pushing her own party to allow that vote to happen so we can get support for grain farmers? Will that happen? Will she talk to the member for Huron—Bruce?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, the member should come to Saskatchewan and tell my farmers and energy workers that they have never had it so good under the Liberal government, propped up by the NDP. They want to work. They want to provide for their families. My farmers know who has been on their side, and it sure as hell has not been the NDP or the Liberals.

The Deputy Speaker: I know that passion tends to get to us a little in this chamber, but I would ask members to try to keep their words more judicious, especially when Canadians are watching.

Business of Supply

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when I hear the Conservatives' speeches, I often think of the story about the wolf who promises to become a vegetarian. I have my doubts.

I listened to my hon. colleague's speech, and it made me think of something called obsession. An obsession is something that leads us to imaginary evil. Imaginary evil leads to delirium. When I hear the term "carbon tax", it strikes me as an imaginary delusion created by an obsession, plain and simple.

I would like my colleague to comment on what she thinks is a fair share of that carbon tax. To hear her tell it, once the Conservatives are in power, the world will be beautiful and there will be rainbows and unicorns everywhere. However, I do not think that has ever really been the case.

How much of the carbon tax is not imaginary evil or a delusion?

• (1330)

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, I am gravely offended by my colleague suggesting that I am delusional or obsessed. The only thing I am obsessed about is representing the people who put me on the ballot, which is my job. It is the job of other opposition parties to do the same, but also the government to listen. The Liberals are destroying the livelihood of the people who I represent. How dare you suggest that I am delusional?

The Deputy Speaker: We are starting to go places where we are calling people names, calling someone delusional, and speaking directly. I want to bring the pressure down in the chamber before we go on to the next speaker. "You" has been used a number of times by all parties in the House. I need to remind members to go through the Chair when they ask questions and give comments.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the working-class cosplay of the Leader of the Opposition. He has been out there with the hard hat, the high-vis vest and the steel-toed boots. Meanwhile, that very same individual loves going to some of Canada's most exclusive neighbourhoods and clubs, wining and dining with the rich of Canada, over 50 times since 2022.

We are getting two images of the Leader of the Opposition. When was the last time the Leader of the Opposition stood with workers who were on strike, out in the wet and cold, fighting against the corporate greed that has been driving a cost-of-living crisis in Canada and for which both Liberals and Conservatives are directly responsible?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader of Canada has been to every area of the country, genuinely listening, not just coming in and going out, but listening and talking with Canadians from every background. He is the only leader in the House who is representing Canadians and representing them well.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the NDP member asked a question about win-

ing and dining when his leader cost the taxpayers \$500,000 last year. He is the most expensive man in Parliament, and he does not know the difference between a bag of potatoes and a bag of apples. How will he ever deliver for Canadians?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, we can see the flip-flopping. An agreement was torn up, and now arts and craft time is here taping up the agreement again. We will see when the rubber hits the road who has confidence in the government. I sure the heck hope that it is not the NDP or the Bloc, because we do not either.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, "It was all a dream", as Biggie Smalls once said, and he laid out a vision of his own experience of growing up with absolutely nothing, putting in hard work with determination, being raised by a single mom and making something of himself.

Similarly, that is what the Canadian dream used to be. That is something my family and millions of other Canadians came here for. Canada used to be the kind of country where if people put in hard work, did the right things and played by the rules, they could afford a house and groceries. Most importantly, people could buy a house in a safe neighbourhood. That is what Canada used to be.

However, after nine years of the corrupt Liberal-NDP government, that Canadian dream is broken. It is gone. In fact, for most of the people who are coming here, that Canadian dream is the Canadian nightmare, with drugs, chaos, crime, disorder and extortion running rampant because of failed soft-on-crime policies. The Liberal-NDP government doubled housing costs, increased the cost of groceries and forced two million Canadians to use food banks. For the first time I have ever heard of, one in four Canadians are skipping meals, and that includes children. That is what failed Liberal-NDP policies have done.

The Liberals did it for votes. They spent more money and put more debt on taxpayers than every single prime minister before them combined. That caused the inflation crisis. That caused the pain and suffering we are seeing in Canadians today.

If anyone thinks this is some accident or, oops, the Liberals did not know what they were doing, it is actually the opposite. They knew exactly what they were doing. The Prime Minister, who is known as a narcissist, wants to play God all the time. He causes the problem and then wants to look like the saviour who will fix the problem. Canadians know it is the Liberal-NDP government that has caused this suffering.

Business of Supply

Housing used to be affordable and did not take up more than 50% of a paycheque. After nine years of the government, now it takes 60% to 80% of a paycheque. That does not leave much at the end of the month. That paycheque is not as powerful. Then when people go to the grocery store or to fill up the gas tank, because of the carbon tax scam, more and more is being taken.

It has gotten to a point where Canadians now have the most indebted households in the entire G7. Housing, and everything else, is up under the government because of its inflationary policies. That is why we are now seeing business and personal insolvencies skyrocketing like we have never seen before.

If we listen to the Liberal-NDP government, everything is fine. It does not bother the government that two million Canadians are visiting a food bank. There is talk about extravagant things all the time. It is because the government is not talking to any of those two million waiting in a food bank, those who are insolvent or those who have to skip meals. The government is not talking to any of them. It is only talking to Liberal insiders, rewarding them with hefty government contracts. Those are the only people that the Liberal-NDP government is talking to.

This costly coalition has taxed the middle class to death. It is not just the carbon tax scam, which, again, is a total scam that does not stop a single forest fire or flood and also does not reduce emissions, but on top of that, it takes more money out of the pockets of Canadians than what they get back. That is why it is a scam.

Not only is the middle class getting hit with that, but there is a second carbon tax scam where there is no so-called rebate at all, which makes things even more expensive. The government has hiked taxes and has now brought in this job-killing capital gains tax hike that for many families is a punishment for their life's entire work and success. For example, the plumber who opened their own business, working sometimes 12 to 16 hours a day, saving dollars, putting their kids through college or university, barely making it through and sometimes not paying themselves so they could pay their employees, might have done what is now a punishment. They might have saved up to buy a plaza for their retirement later on.

• (1335)

However, the government thought that was too greedy of people, that they would do too well. Now the government is going to punish them with this job-killing capital gains tax hike. These people did everything by the rules. They have suffered through the current government and they know now that success is punished in this country. Liberals do not even let people enjoy drinks because they keep raising the escalator tax.

The economic pain and destruction is unbelievable. In fact, \$460 billion of Canadian investment fled to the U.S. That means it went to American workers, American infrastructure and American pipelines when it should have stayed right here at home. It is because of the failed Liberal-NDP policies that that happened.

I recall seeing headlines in 2014, under a strong, common-sense Conservative government, that said the American dream had moved to Canada. Just recently, the Toronto Star came out with an article that said the Canadian dream is gone and has fled to the U.S.

That is nine years of economic vandalism by the Liberal-NDP government. It has over-regulated, overburdened and over-red-taped Canada, and “over-bureaucracy” is the theme of the government, so much so that no one wants to build anything here, manufacture anything here or, in fact, live here anymore. That is what the government has done.

Hundreds of thousands of bright people are leaving our country because they see no hope here. Canada used to look like the beacon of hope. It used to be a place people would talk about and say they could not wait to move to. Now Canada has become not only a laughingstock because of its joke of a Prime Minister but a place where, when they move here, people say the promise that they could work hard and get somewhere was a lie all along. It is because the government will do anything and everything to attack hard work, a powerful paycheque and, most important, success. It does not want anyone to be successful, unless they are Liberal connected insiders.

It is clear that Canadians are getting poorer and their paycheques do not go as far. Our GDP per person, or the success of an individual who lives here, is diminishing quarter after quarter. The government says things are great here, but Canadians, especially our workers, are falling further behind than their American counterparts.

However, it is time now. Canadians have had enough. They are calling for a carbon tax election now. It is time for the leader of the NDP to put the greed for his \$2.2-million pension aside, and it is time to go to an election to give Canadians the choice. Rather than having the Liberal-NDP government and its radical, wacko ideology of this carbon tax scam that it is absolutely obsessed with, we should put it to Canadians. We already know a majority of them do not want this carbon tax scam. Why do we not leave it to Canadians to decide whether they want more of their food, success and fuel taxed under the costly coalition, or a common-sense Conservative government under the leadership of the member for Carleton?

Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. We will bring home that Canadian dream and the Canada we all love and used to know, the one that millions of Canadians used to be proud of, the one when we used to stand tall behind our Canadian flag wherever we went. That has become a joke under the Prime Minister.

Let us bring that Canada home once again under a common-sense Conservative government.

Business of Supply

• (1340)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing about members of the official opposition is that they like to talk down our country. They like to talk down our economy. They want to talk down the best country in the world. It is the best country in the world. They have not seen it and they do not acknowledge it, but it is.

In our budget, we have about a 1% deficit to GDP versus the U.S. at 7%. We have a AAA credit rating. We went through a global pandemic where we had the backs of Canadians and we assisted them and businesses.

Would the hon. member not admit that any country in the world would love to have our fiscal framework to continue to make key investments in the hard-working Canadians we represent?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, if the member would admit that he wanted to cross the floor over to us because he was fed up—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Does the hon. member wish to take that off the record? I am offended by that statement. He knows it is not true.

The Deputy Speaker: That is a discussion between the two members. If they want to take it off-line, they can do so.

The hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are offended. Those two million Canadians who are waiting in a food bank line, with a million more projected this year; the moms who are having to double- and triple-check how much they can afford at the grocery store this week; the one in four Canadians who are skipping meals; the kids who are hungry when they go to school: those are the people who are offended. Those are the people common-sense Conservatives are standing up for against the corrupt, out-of-touch Liberal-NDP costly coalition that has punished them for just being Canadian. We are going to bring back the Canada that people will be proud of, where people can afford a house, afford groceries and live in safe communities once again, under the leadership of the member for Carleton.

• (1345)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us have a debate on the content. I know this subject quite well.

The member talked a lot about the carbon tax in his introduction. I would like to talk to him about Bill C-234. We have had a lot of discussions about it in the House. There has also been a lot of tension around this bill. Yesterday, in my speech, I explained that we had chosen to accept the Senate amendments and that we could put the bill to a vote. This bill has been in the House since January, but the Conservatives will not let us vote on it.

I will ask my colleague the following question. Why not vote in favour of the grain drying exemption? That would give something meaningful to farmers right away. Are the Conservatives ready to put the bill to a vote?

[*English*]

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-234 was an amazing, great, common-sense Conservative bill in its original form. However, since the radical, ideological, orange jumpsuit-wearing environment minister bullied senators into changing it into some radical new form, it would do nothing but punish farmers even more. Not only is the government punishing farmers with its carbon tax scam and radical ideologies, but Bill C-234 in its original form would have rewarded our hard-working farmers. This is one thing Liberals have failed to admit: If we are taxing the farmer who is making the food and the trucker who is shipping the food, at the end of the day, that cost all gets passed down to the person who is purchasing the food.

It is time to axe the tax and bring back Bill C-234 in its original form to get the cost of food down again.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate the member for his ability to memorize the slogans, but he would not know the difference between truth and a slogan if the great goddess of truth herself came down from the heavens, painted herself purple and danced on his desk for a week. He would still be reciting the same dumbed-down slogans.

I want to ask him: Why is it that when Erin O'Toole said it was the Chinese Communist Party that helped take him down, not a single member of the Conservative backbench, or any of them, stood up to question foreign interference that took down a credible Conservative leader and put in the guy who is living in Stornoway now?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, what a joke. I stood up in the House and said to name the MPs who are working in the best interests of foreign governments and not this one. We are asking for that inquiry to be opened—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Back to this question of the goddess of truth, name them. Name them in the Conservative ranks. That is what Erin O'Toole is challenging them to do.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order. I keep reminding folks to start quoting things from the Standing Orders so they are actual points of order.

The hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, why does that member not walk across the aisle to his out-of-touch leader and tell him to put his \$2.2-million pension aside and let us take this to an election today? Let us go to the polls and let Canadians decide, so we can have a full-blown inquiry and figure out who those members are in the House who are working in the interest of foreign governments and not in the best interests of Canadians.

Common-sense Conservatives will always work in the best interests of Canadians, unlike the out-of-touch and costly coalition.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn for the great work he does in his riding. I have family members there and they speak very highly of him, as do many of his constituents when I am out there visiting.

Has the hon. member heard the same thing I have heard over and over again in my riding of North Okanagan—Shuswap about how people have just had enough? They have had enough of the carbon tax. They have had enough of the government, which simply sees Canadians as a tax source for its out-of-control spending. Has he heard the same issues in his riding?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the member for helping flip thousands of pancakes over the years at my breakfast. I am grateful to his daughter, granddaughter and son-in-law for all the great work they do.

I am hearing the exact same thing. The simple message I am getting, whether someone has lived here their whole life or moved here, is that Canada is not Canada anymore. It is not the Canada we used to know. After nine years of the government punishing our paycheques, punishing us for success and punishing us for our hard work, Canada has become a place where nobody wants to live anymore.

However, we are going to turn that around. We are going to give Canadians hope. It is time for the government to call a carbon tax election so we can give Canadians the leadership they deserve, which is going to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget, stop the crime and bring home the Canadian dream again.

• (1350)

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to be here today to speak on behalf of the people who sent me to represent them in the House of Commons, the people of London West.

This morning, the leader of the official opposition said that if the Conservatives formed government, they would run things the way they did before, specifically referring to when Harper's Conservatives were in power. That is a big shame. After all, this Conservative Party has promised to create barbaric cultural practices such as hotlines that encourage Canadians to spy on one another. It was this Conservative Party that kept families apart through limited family reunification targets, only because it did not want to let many seniors into this country.

Yesterday, the member for Calgary Forest Lawn spent time filibustering a bill that was first moved by the member for Brandon—Souris, who was the sponsor of the bill. He said the Conservatives would make sure they did not oppose the motion, yet they spent three hours filibustering it, misleading Canadians and not following the promises they made.

It was this Conservative Party that introduced significant cuts to the interim federal health program in 2012, which provided health care to refugees and asylum seekers. These cuts led to limited access to central health services for many refugees, including children and pregnant women. The Federal Court eventually ruled that these cuts were cruel and unusual.

It was this Conservative Party that voted against funding the interim housing assistance program ahead of the cold winter months, playing political games, as they have done since we came back to Parliament, with the lives of vulnerable refugees and asylum seekers, again misleading Canadians that they are here to serve. They are here to cut programs that are vital and essential to Canadians.

It was this Conservative Party that shut down the family reunification program for two years, separating families. In fact, a statement made by the former immigration minister under the Harper Conservatives said, "If you think your parents may need to go on welfare in Canada, please don't sponsor them." This was from a minister in Harper's government. It was the same Conservative Party that accused vulnerable asylum seekers and refugees of abusing Canada's generosity.

The Conservatives are doing what they know best, and that is dividing and misleading Canadians. Shame on them. We will not stand for it, nor will we dignify their shameful tactics to divide Canadians.

Let us talk about what the Conservative Party is doing right now at the citizenship and immigration committee. I want to remind the House what the Conservatives said about Bill C-71, an act to amend the Citizenship Act, during second reading debate. There has been a six-hour filibuster on a motion at the immigration committee regarding Bill C-71.

I will take this opportunity to share that I will be splitting my time with the member for Davenport. I got carried away.

I would like to share some of the context on Bill C-71. Given the recent legal changes to the first-generation limit that Harper's Conservatives introduced, it was clear that changes were needed to the Citizenship Act to address cohorts of excluded citizens. This is especially relevant for those born outside of Canada to a Canadian parent.

In 2009, several amendments to the Citizenship Act remedied the majority of the older lost Canadian cases by providing and restoring citizenship and removing the need for anyone to file to retain their citizenship by their 28th birthday. However, the Harper Conservatives introduced the first-generation limit, which the Supreme Court of Ontario has now deemed unconstitutional based on equality and mobility rights.

The leader of the official opposition has suggested that he would use the notwithstanding clause if given the chance, and that the Conservatives are considering taking away people's rights when it suits them. What the Conservatives did here is a concrete example of taking away the rights of Canadians, and I think they will do it again if given the opportunity. When Conservatives say that Canadians have nothing to fear, Canadians need to take note of what they have done in the past, as they have repeatedly said they would run the system exactly how they did before.

Statements by Members

• (1355)

Bill S-245, a Senate public bill on the lost Canadians issue, was sponsored by a Conservative senator. However, during the study on this bill, the Conservative Party filibustered for over 30 hours. During that time, the member of Parliament for Calgary Forest Lawn, who is the sponsor for Bill S-245 and the former Conservative immigration critic, recommended the introduction of a private member's bill or government bill to address the remaining cohort of lost Canadians. I want to point out that the Conservative Party continues to trade down this bill, even though it corresponds with its leader, who has assured us that the Conservatives will continue to support and advocate for this legislation.

As I said earlier, the member for Calgary Forest Lawn was quoted as saying that they will make sure there is no opposition to it, yet yesterday, the Conservatives spent hours filibustering, with different colleagues in rotation coming to filibuster. It was very misleading that they told Canadians there would be no opposition and it would be passed quickly. These Canadians came to our committee. The Conservatives listened to witnesses and heard them, yet they still misled them and moved into a filibuster.

We have a government bill in front of us that we want to pass. It is wrong that the Harper Conservatives created this division in the first place. However, once again, the Conservative Party is playing political games with the lives of Canadians. Nothing about that is new. They have done it before and are doing it again. I hope Canadians are watching.

The Conservatives are delaying Bill C-71 from going to committee so it can be debated. They are also filibustering at the immigration committee regarding the motion on Bill C-71. I am so disappointed that the Conservatives have been sharing misinformation and attempting to stoke division and drive fear into the hearts of Canadians, but I cannot say that I am surprised.

The Conservatives constantly talk about people's pensions. They talk about the NDP leader's pension, yet they do not talk about the fact that their own leader has a pension of \$230,000. The Conservatives also do not want to address why their leader does not have a security clearance right now. These are all questions that Canadians need answers to, and Conservatives should be asking them themselves.

On this side of the House, we remain committed to righting the wrongs of the unconstitutional first-generation limit on families. We continue to support newcomers. We will continue to provide a safe haven for vulnerable asylum seekers, all the while ensuring that our growth is sustainable and that we continue to build more homes and grow our economy. We have prioritized family reunification by expanding the spousal, parents and grandparents sponsorship program, increasing our annual levels and lowering financial requirements.

We are taking action to restore the integrity of the international student program, protecting students from instances of abuse and exploitation. We have made it easier for foreign national physicians with job opportunities to remain here in Canada and seek permanent residency. We have also launched a health-specific category under express entry to help address labour shortages in the health

care sector so that Canadians can receive the quality health care they deserve.

We introduced the home child care provider pilot and home support worker pilot to provide pathways to PR for caregivers. We are also the first country to introduce a special humanitarian stream for women leaders, human rights defenders, LGBTQI+ individuals, persecuted minorities and journalists.

On this side of the House, we will always support newcomers, asylum seekers, refugees and citizens, and we will always stand shoulder to shoulder with them every step of the way.

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what I heard in my colleague's speech today, I happen to spend a lot of time in London. My riding neighbour is in London and my new riding will include London.

I am not hearing those things from the people in London. What I am hearing from people in London and all the surrounding areas is that they want a carbon tax election. They have lost confidence in the government. They have lost confidence in the Prime Minister. I wonder why the member will not vote non-confidence in the government.

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear my hon. colleague on the other side talk about London. It is very important to talk about London. My mother, who is a voter, is going to be a new voter in my colleague's riding and I have not heard her mention the member's name once.

It is important to talk about the things that Canadians care about. The questions that we are—

• (1400)

The Speaker: I am afraid we have come to the end of the period for debate.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

ALBERT "ALBY" BISHOP

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, Alby was a light to all who knew him. He loved to sing and dance, and he brought joy across our community with his performances. He was deeply loved and had a bright future ahead.

Alby wanted to live, but in June of this year, his parents, Lisa and Albert, lost Alby, who was just 23 years old, to the poison drug crisis. In his mom's words, she shared, "Close your eyes and imagine losing your child to this. We are losing children left and right. We have to do something."

In fact, experts tell us that we have to do more of everything: more treatment, more mental health supports, more housing and more harm reduction. In the meantime, I send my thanks to frontline workers who are saving lives, such as those at Sanguen, The Working Centre, Community Healthcaring and Thresholds in my community. I encourage all of my colleagues to support expanding the resources frontline workers provide so parents do not have to lose their children this way.

* * *

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, September 30 is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, also known as Orange Shirt Day. It is an occasion for all Canadians to honour survivors and the children who never returned home.

This day is also an opportunity to remember and recognize the centennial and invaluable solidarity between indigenous peoples and Chinese Canadians in British Columbia. The Musqueam people stood with the early Chinese immigrants at a time when support was most needed. Both communities co-created the Chinese market gardens on the Musqueam reserve.

As we reflect on this important history, we must remember the kindness, selflessness and courage of our indigenous peoples. Truth needs to come forward before reconciliation. Let us continue on the path toward reconciliation and move toward healing.

* * *

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour today to recognize Captain William H. Wilson, a man who has served his country and his community more in his 100 years than any of us could possibly dream of doing in 100 lifetimes.

Captain Wilson served with the Royal Canadian Navy on the HMCS *Ottawa* on D-Day and was honoured with the Atlantic Star for his bravery. The Royal Canadian Navy named him the first honorary captain of Canada's first submarine squadron in honour of his tireless efforts to raise awareness of Canada's deep navy history.

Known as "The Rabbit", he has this uncanny ability to find amazing artifacts for the Naval Museum in Calgary, a facility many believe would not even exist were it not for his tireless efforts. Whether it was during his time as the manager for the transportation of the 1988 Olympics, during his long career at CP Rail or when he was honoured with the Alberta Order of Excellence, his commitment to community is unparalleled.

I ask members to please join me in the House to wish Captain Bill a happy 100th birthday. Foothills thanks him for his service.

* * *

ST. JOHN'S EAST

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across St. John's East this summer, what I heard was clear. We need to protect our progress. Parents want more \$10-a-day child care spaces. Ten thousand Newfoundland and Labradorians went to the dentist, many for the first time in many years. Kids go to school

Statements by Members

now with full bellies because of the food school program investment. People want to see more climate action, not less, and health care remains a top priority, which is why we have made significant investments.

I have heard from the people of St. John's East that they want this progress to continue, not to be cancelled and not to be cut.

* * *

[Translation]

STÉPHANE GRENIER

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Stéphane Grenier's 20 years of dedicated service on La Piaule's board of directors, as well as his unwavering commitment to helping the less fortunate in Val-d'Or.

Thanks to him, La Piaule has been able to expand and provide vital support to many people in need. His leadership, kindness and determination have helped our community become more united and inclusive. Through his actions, Stéphane has shown that it is possible to really make a difference. He has listened to, supported and defended the rights of the most vulnerable members of society, while putting in place the resources necessary to meet the challenges facing our community. He has always been present on the ground, where needs are most keenly felt, whether it was to provide a meal, comfort a person in distress or simply lend an listening ear. Thanks to him, many major projects have seen the light of day in Val-d'Or, including the Château de Marie-Ève.

Stéphane is an example to us all. What he has accomplished reminds us of the importance of acting out of love and working together. I thank him for everything.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR SUMMER GAMES

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding young athletes in Avalon who took part in the 2024 Newfoundland and Labrador Summer Games this past August, hosted by the town of Bay Roberts. Thousands of young athletes aged 13 to 15 from across the province showed exemplary sportsmanship, athleticism, teamwork and skill. It was an honour to witness such a remarkable celebration of sport and community.

A special thanks goes out to Walter Yetman, mayor of the town of Bay Roberts; the members of the organizing committee; and especially Judy Morrow and Neil Kearley, the co-chairs of the Newfoundland and Labrador Summer Games, who have been a part of this initiative since 2018. A sincere thanks also goes out to each coach, parent, family member, volunteer, spectator, driver and sponsor for their support. It would not have happened without them.

Statements by Members

Today, these young people are our athletes. Tomorrow, they will be our leaders. I invite all members to join me in applauding everyone involved with the 2024 Newfoundland and Labrador Summer Games.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after years of the Prime Minister, life has never been more expensive for Canadians. He has doubled the debt, doubled housing costs, caused the worst inflation in 40 years, sent two million people to the food bank and unleashed crime and chaos in our communities.

The Liberals' NDP coalition partners have been there to support them every turn of the way. The NDP leader claimed he ripped up their coalition agreement in a desperate attempt to distance himself from their disastrous record, but now, with a motion of confidence on the table, he is putting himself and his pension ahead of Canadians.

Canadians are desperate for change. It is time for the Bloc and the NDP to stop protecting the costly Prime Minister. We need a carbon tax election now so Canadians can vote to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

* * *

SPORT IN BRAMPTON SOUTH

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we had a very busy summer in Brampton and today I would like to highlight the incredible achievements of our residents in sports.

Bramptonians played in Copa America and represented Canada at the Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games in Paris. Brampton is Canada's cricket capital, and we hosted a world-famous G20 tournament, where global stars played at the highest level, inspiring us all. While a record-breaking ice hockey game, organized by the City of Brampton, raised over \$1 million for our local hospital, all-age field hockey and kabaddi tournaments continue to grow in popularity. I was especially pleased to present awards to our youngest players at the children's soccer tournament in Brampton South.

Sports are key to good health and well-being. Let us continue to celebrate our athletes and promote active living in Brampton and across Canada.

* * *

SENIORS

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the summer, I had the privilege of engaging with the vibrant, 55-plus, older adult community across my riding of Winnipeg South Centre. From visits to the Parkway, Riverbend Plaza, Fred Tipping Place, Riverwood Square, Villa Cabrini and the Thorvaldson Care Center, I witnessed first-hand the contributions of older adults to our community. One highlight was meeting the residents' council at Riverbend Plaza, where we discussed the safe long-term care act, a national strategy on aging and the importance of aging close to home.

We also celebrated the 65th anniversary of the Thorvaldson Care Center, Manitoba's only intermediate care facility, where three generations of the Thorvaldson family have provided compassionate care to older adults. This anniversary is a powerful reminder of the importance of establishing strong standards in long-term care to ensure dignity and quality for all Canadians as they age.

A special thanks goes out to Moira Jones and everyone on my Winnipeg South Centre older adults council for enriching the fabric of our community.

* * *

● (1410)

[*Translation*]**BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS**

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we are moving a non-confidence motion to stop Canada from being destroyed by this Liberal minority government that has been in place for far too long.

First, the NDP kept this government on life support, and now it is the Bloc Québécois' turn. That party goes around telling everyone that they are the defenders of Quebec, yet François Legault, the Premier of Quebec, the person who speaks on behalf of Quebeckers, is asking the Bloc to bring down this incompetent government.

Why say one thing and do the opposite? Instead of aiding and abetting the Liberals, the Bloc Québécois should be defending Quebeckers. For example, the Bloc Québécois is a very bad negotiator. It could not even get the caribou order revoked.

The Bloc Québécois is selling its soul to this Liberal government without getting anything for Quebeckers in return. What is the Bloc Québécois good for, anyway? The Bloc Québécois voted to spend more money and double the size of the government. All this was done in the midst of multiple scandals and paid for with Quebeckers' money, our money.

What is the Bloc Québécois good for? One thing is for sure: It is not good for Quebeckers.

* * *

[*English*]**GAYLE CHRISTIE**

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember my dear friend Gayle Christie, former mayor of the borough of York, who passed away on August 14 and was laid to rest on September 8.

Gayle's journey began in Toronto, where she first stepped into public service as a trustee on the Board of Education. Her dedication propelled her to become the alderman, and ultimately she became the mayor of York from 1978 to 1982, representing her community on Metro Toronto Council.

Statements by Members

Gayle's legacy is a testament to the power of perseverance and passion. As a mother and a woman who was active in politics, she inspired countless others to break barriers and pursue their dreams in leadership roles, myself included. Her unwavering commitment serves as a reminder that women can, and women should, be at the forefront of decision-making. As we reflect on her contributions, let us honour Gayle's memory by continuing her fight for equality in her communities.

I send my deepest condolences to the family.

* * *

VEHICLE THEFT

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Under this soft-on-crime Liberal government, car theft is up 34%, including being up by over 300% in Toronto. We know that in Ontario, 68% of those convicted for an auto theft-related offence serve a sentence of six months or less. Just recently, we learned that Ontario's carjacking task force made 124 arrests between September 2023 and March 2024. Shockingly, nearly half of the people arrested by the task force were out on bail at the time of their arrest, and 61% of those offenders were subsequently released on bail yet again.

This crime wave is a direct result of this government's soft-on-crime, catch-and-release policies, which repealed mandatory minimum sentences and made bail more accessible to criminals. Tomorrow, on behalf of all Canadians, there is a chance to bring down this costly government and stop the crime. Will the NDP-Liberal government let Canadians decide in a carbon tax election?

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Two years ago, the sellout leader of the NDP sold out workers and signed on to a costly coalition with the Liberal Prime Minister, who hiked taxes, ballooned food costs, doubled housing costs and unleashed record crime and chaos on our once-safe streets. On top of all that, he voted in favour of quadrupling the carbon tax to 61¢ a litre.

Tomorrow, on behalf of all Canadians, there is a chance to break down this costly government. Canadians need a carbon tax election now to decide between the costly coalition of the NDP-Liberals, who tax our food, punish our work, take our money, double our housing cost, and unleash crime and drugs in our communities, or Conservatives, who will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

MILITARY FAMILY APPRECIATION DAY

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week we marked the sixth annual Military Family Appreciation Day.

This year, the day held special meaning for my family. My husband, who was an honorary colonel in the Sherbrooke Hussars, and I are very proud of our son, who is currently on a mission in Latvia. Along with many other Canadian military personnel, he is taking part in Operation Reassurance, our contribution to NATO's deterrence and defence measures in central and eastern Europe.

Today, my thoughts are with all the families like ours who make the sacrifice of sharing one of their own so that Canada can carry out its role as a peacekeeper in the world. As we know, the current global context requires us to strengthen our presence in different regions of the world to prevent conflicts from spreading.

Let us be proud of Canada's contribution on the international stage, let us be proud of our military personnel, but let us also be proud of their families who offer them unwavering support.

* * *

[*English*]

OPIOIDS

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the opioid nightmare is devastating small and medium-sized towns, which simply do not have the resources to address the overwhelming nature of the crisis. People are dying from poisoned drugs, a lack of treatment opportunities, a housing crisis and predatory gangs that are making our neighbourhoods unsafe.

The city of Timmins recently held the first-ever municipal summit on addressing the opioid crisis. The message is clear: Municipalities cannot do this on their own. The federal government needs to be at the table with increased mental health supports, a credible housing strategy that smaller communities can take advantage of, funding for treatment and recovery, and empowering police with a credible gang strategy to shut down the violence. In Timmins, the Fire Keepers, indigenous teams working the streets to keep people safe and alive, could be a national model.

What we do not need are Conservative MPs pouring gasoline on the crisis, which has led to serious death threats against doctors and nurses who are keeping people safe and alive. In the end, our job is keeping people safe on our streets and keeping our loved ones alive.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

MAUDE CHARRON

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on August 8, a great woman became the pride of Sainte-Luce-sur-Mer and of all Quebecers.

Maude Charron won the silver medal in the 59-kilogram event at the Paris Olympics after lifting a total weight of 236 kilos. With her family on hand to support her, this weightlifter from La Mitis achieved a second victory after her gold medal win at the 2021 Tokyo Games. This made her the second Canadian weightlifter to ever win an Olympic gold medal.

Her efforts and her journey are an inspiration to all of eastern Quebec, which watched her feat of strength in awe. She certainly captured the hearts of people in the regions when she took a swig of Quebec maple syrup just before her performance. Some people provide daily inspiration with their resilience and audacity. Maude Charron is one of them.

I congratulate Maude and thank her for everything. The people of Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia are proud of her.

* * *

[English]

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Nearly every day, Canadians are waking up to the news of a new conflict of interest scandal involving carbon tax Carney. Just days after he became the special adviser to the Prime Minister, his first piece of advice was for the Prime Minister to give him \$10 billion in taxpayers' money to be used in a new investment fund. Next, it was \$2 billion in taxpayers' loans to his friends at Telesat for work that other companies could have done at half the cost. As if that were not enough, he is also advocating for mortgage rule changes that would directly benefit his mortgage insurer.

Fortunately, tomorrow there will be a vote of non-confidence in the NDP-Liberal coalition so Canadians can have a carbon tax election. Canadians should be the ones who decide between four more years of corruption and carbon taxes or a new Conservative government to clean up the mess.

* * *

● (1420)

VEHICLE THEFT

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is very important to the residents of Mississauga—Erin Mills: the concern of auto theft and its impact on the lives of my constituents. That is why the Liberal government is working across jurisdictions to enact real solutions to crack down on auto theft and make our communities safer.

Our national auto theft summit in February led to a national action plan, enhanced detection at major ports and stronger collaboration with local police. It is thanks to these collective efforts that au-

to thefts decreased by 17% in the first six months of 2024. This success is due in no small part to our local police forces, and I want to particularly highlight Chief Nishan Duraiappah, Deputy Chief Nick Milinovich and Peel Regional Police officers for their incredible efforts to arrest criminals and recover stolen vehicles through project odyssey and more initiatives. This is what real action looks like.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Bloc Québécois will have to vote on a motion and decide whether it will enable the most centralizing, costly government in the history of Canada, a government that is bad for Quebec, to stay in power. This government doubled the cost of housing and doubled the national debt. The Premier of Quebec has said that the Quebec nation does not want the House to show confidence in this government.

Even the Liberal Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship said that the government broke the immigration system. If the minister himself does not have confidence in this government's track record, then why should the Bloc Québécois?

The Speaker: As I mentioned yesterday, questions must pertain to the administration of government so that members can get clear answers.

The hon. Minister of Public Services and Procurement.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader obviously still does not understand the rules of the House, even after being here for 20 years. Another thing that he still does not understand is the importance of dental care for Quebecers. He is talking about hurting Quebecers.

What is he telling Quebecers in my region? He is telling them not to enrol in the Canadian dental care plan because it does not exist, when 800,000 seniors in Quebec have enrolled in the plan. Meanwhile, he is telling them not to enrol, that the plan does not exist.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government has doubled the cost of housing for people in the Quebec City area, tripled the cost of housing in Montreal and inflated the price of food, forcing two million Canadians to turn to food banks every month. It has pushed Quebec to the breaking point, with an immigration system that even the Liberal minister says is broken. The Quebec nation does not want a centralizing, costly government.

Will the members vote for an election in order to elect a common-sense government?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of hypocrisy in a question that is supposed to show concern for people's lives, when the leader of the Conservative Party cannot even clearly state his hidden agenda and when the member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands got a paid trip to Florida to flog an anti-abortion, anti-women's rights vision.

The first thing he should do is get his caucus under control and reassure women here in Canada that this right will not be touched.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, costs are up, taxes are up, crime is up and time is up. The government has doubled the cost of housing, doubled the debt, forced two million people to the food bank and raised taxes, and now it wants a 61¢-a-litre carbon tax that will grind our economy to a halt. The good news is that in a carbon tax election, Canadians can axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Can we bring it home now?

• (1425)

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, maybe I can speak in language the Leader of the Opposition will understand. Conservatives are going to cut the dental, they are going to axe pharmacare, they are going to break the health system and they are going to destroy child care. The difference between those slogans and the nonsense he throws around, the vacuous garbage that is best left for Nabisco and not for the House of Commons, is that is the stuff he is actually going to do.

At some point, he is going to have to look in the eyes of seniors and tell them what he is going to do to dental care. He is going to have to look in the eyes of diabetes patients and say what he is going to do with their diabetes medication. At some time, the vitriol is done and the truth comes out.

The Speaker: Colleagues, we are skating pretty close to the line. I recommend that members ensure that they do not do that.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I understand that when the member thinks of the prospect of a carbon tax election, he becomes unglued. He becomes very rattled and loses control of himself, waving his hands around because he is desperate to quadruple the carbon tax to 61¢ a litre. He is desperate to push a government takeover that will shut down people's private drug plans and ban them from having access to their medical plans.

Common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget, stop the crime and protect people's drug plan. How about that?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the guy who said dental care does not exist. This is the guy

Oral Questions

who said providers will not sign up. Well, I have news; 750,000 people across this country got care. I also have news that more than 80% of providers have signed up. We are getting it done.

He can farmonger and he can scare people, but we are going to get it done on pharma as well. We are going to make sure that diabetes patients get their medication. We are going to make sure that women get their contraceptives, because that is what freedom looks like: a woman who has choice over her own body.

The Speaker: I would like to remind all members that questions should be asked and answers should be directed through the Chair. I am going to again ask members to make sure we do not skate too close to the line.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what his plan does is quadruple the carbon tax to 61¢ a litre and impose a single payer that bans women from using their existing private plans to get contraceptives or any other form of medication. That is what a "single payer" means, and that is not what freedom looks like. What he actually wants to do is quadruple the carbon tax, which will grind our economy to a halt. It will be a nuclear winter for our economy.

Why do we not allow Canadians to vote in a carbon tax election to decide if they are ready to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will tell the House what freedom does not look like. It does not look like Conservative members of Parliament taking all-expenses-paid trips to Florida to talk about how—

Mr. Michael Barrett: Which 35 of you are going to be here after the next election?

The Speaker: I would appreciate it if the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes would refrain from speaking out of turn. I know that he will have his turn to ask questions.

The hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons from the top, please.

• (1430)

Hon. Karina Gould: Mr. Speaker, I will tell the House what freedom does not look like, which is Conservative members of Parliament taking all-expenses-paid trips to talk at anti-abortion conferences and to push forward an anti-abortion vision of Canada. When the leader of the Conservative Party talks about women's rights, he neglects to share his hidden agenda that would take away their reproductive rights. When he talks about freedom, he only talks about half of the story.

Today what we are doing is demonstrating that the House does not have confidence in the leader of the Conservative Party.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***SENIORS**

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, time is running out for the Liberals. Decision time is almost here. They will have to choose between economic justice for seniors and an election. They can stop creating two classes of seniors by denying people 74 and under the 10% OAS increase that was given to older seniors, or they can officially consult the public, hoping beyond hope that the polls are wrong. We are siding with seniors.

What will the Liberals choose? The clock is ticking.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Bloc Québécois, the Liberal Party of Canada has been there for seniors these past years.

We increased the guaranteed income supplement by \$1,000. This helped nearly one million seniors in Canada. We increased the guaranteed income supplement earnings exemption by 40% so that working seniors can keep more of what they earn.

The Bloc Québécois voted against those measures.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, seniors deserve more than partisanship. Our request is clear. Seniors deserve clearer answers than that.

We are talking about seniors who have worked for decades toward a good retirement. Today, however, they are seeing their purchasing power crumble while the cost of living rises. These people deserve real answers when we talk to them about their income. Seniors are listening. The question is important, so we are going to ask it again.

Will the Liberals increase old age security for seniors under 75, yes or no?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat myself for the benefit of my friend from La Prairie and his political party: Quebec's seniors have the right to wake up this morning and ask what just happened to them.

Bloc members have always voted against seniors. They have always voted against our plans to improve the lives of seniors, especially the most vulnerable. Recently, they voted against the dental care plan for Quebec seniors.

Shame on them.

* * *

*[English]***HEALTH**

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are too weak to stand up to Doug Ford, so some patients are leaving surgeries with thousands of dollars in bills. The Liberals are too weak to stand up to Danielle Smith, so people in her province are forced to pay to see a doctor. That is what Conservatives do. They cut and gut health care so their big business buddies can use that to rip off Canadians even more.

Why is the Liberal government letting Conservatives privatize our health care system?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be talking about being too weak, two days after the NDP leader got a letter from the Leader of the Opposition saying to back out of standing up for pharmacare and to standing up for improvements to the health care system, he ran away. If he ran away from that, how is he going to stand up for Canadians?

We had a chance. We were working well together. We got things done on dental, 750,000 people and over 80% of providers. We were working well together on pharmacare. If he has ideas, he knows we were all ears. However, he is all about politics. He is all about trying to divide rather than working together.

• (1435)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have let Conservative premiers privatize their health care systems and have done nothing about it.

[Translation]

The last Conservative government cut health care funding by \$43.5 billion. That is the salary of more than 60,000 nurses every year.

Now Conservative premiers, like François Legault, are privatizing our health care system, and the Liberals are doing nothing about it.

Why are the Liberals doing nothing to protect people and to protect the Canada Health Act?

[English]

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I get frustrated, because there is an existential crisis facing our health system. It is represented in the person of the Conservative leader, whose cuts and approach to health care, to destroy pharmacare, to attack dental care and to undermine the deals that we have signed with provinces and territories, greatly menace this thing that we treasure, public health.

The investments that we made must continue. The progress we made must continue. That is why I urge parliamentarians to stand up against what the Conservatives would do to this health system, and work collaboratively to make sure we get the care that every Canadian deserves.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, we know that it is just not worth the cost, and the evidence is everywhere we look.

Oral Questions

In Ontario, for the first time ever, over a million people visited a food bank in just one year. That is thanks to the radical Liberal-NDP carbon tax. Ontario families say that they just cannot keep up with the mountain of debt and the taxes that the Prime Minister has poured all over them.

Why will the government not call a carbon tax election and let Canadians decide?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read an extract from a report that came out today from the Insurance Bureau of Canada. It states, “Summer of 2024...ranks as the most-destructive season in Canadian history for insured losses due to severe weather. In only two months, July and August, this summer eclipsed the worst year on record and has pushed the 2024 year-to-date tally to over \$7.7 billion” in severe natural catastrophes.

What is the answer from the Leader of the Opposition? Let the planet burn. We will not take that on this side of the House.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thought the carbon tax was supposed to fix all that.

The Liberals will not call a carbon tax election because they know exactly what Canadians will say. The year 2023 was the eighth consecutive year that food bank usage rose. By some great coincidence, it was also the eighth consecutive year of the Liberal government.

How many more people need to visit or need to be forced to a food bank before the environment minister admits that taxes are up, that costs are up, that crime is up and that his time is up?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Conservative Party and its leader are not there to protect Canadians. They are there to protect the interests of their friends, like oil executives who attended a special event for the Leader of the Opposition. I can assure everyone that oil executives do not come to my fundraiser.

However, what the Conservatives want to do is take away something. In his riding of Carleton, 58,000 people are receiving the Canada carbon rebate. In Thornhill, more than 60,000 people are receiving more money than what they pay in carbon pricing. We are helping with affordability and we are helping to fight climate change.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and, yes, time is up.

According to the Liberal-NDP government's own statistics, the number of Canadians suffering with food insecurity is up 111%. That is a quarter of Canadians who do not know where their next meal is coming from. However, there is a solution: Axe the carbon tax and give Canadians the relief they need.

The Liberals know that 70% of Canadians want to axe the tax. Will they listen to Canadians tomorrow and call a carbon tax election?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be great in the House if the official opposition actually worked with facts. The vast majority of

Canadians get more money back. We have a climate plan that is working, fighting the existential threat of climate change, but it is also creating economic opportunity and prosperity for the future.

We have seen over 100 clean growth projects and \$60 billion of investment. It is the \$12 billion Dow invested in Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta. It is the Jansen potash mine. It is the Sayona lithium plant in Quebec. It is a plan that is working. The Conservatives have no plan for the future on the environment and no plan on the economy.

• (1440)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is what their plan is doing. The Liberal-NDP carbon tax is driving up costs on farmers, on truckers, on food manufacturers and prices at the grocery store, and Canadians cannot afford to put food on the table. According to Food Banks Alberta, use is up 73%, and 40% of those are children. Meanwhile, the Liberal-NDP government says that Canadians have never had it so good, while food banks are struggling just to meet demand.

If the Liberal-NDP government thinks that its carbon tax is so great, will it call a carbon tax election tomorrow and let Canadians decide?

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development and to the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand that children are the ones suffering from food insecurity in these tough times, and that is why we introduced the school food program. This program will help feed 400,000 more children than are currently being fed. We are working with the provinces and territories to implement this program, which will really help children.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is a bad government for Quebec. After nine years, the “Liberal Bloc” has doubled the cost of housing, caused the worst inflation in 40 years, forced students to live in their parents' basements, pushed Quebec to the breaking point on immigration, voted 188 times to save the Prime Minister and voted for \$500 billion in inflationary spending.

Oral Questions

Tomorrow, will the Prime Minister and his lieutenant from Beloeil—Chambly allow Quebecers to choose a common-sense government in an election?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to answer a question about inflation. The good news is that in August, inflation fell to 2%. Inflation has been within the Bank of Canada's target range all year. As a result, the bank started lowering the key interest rate. That is good news for Canadians. All the Conservatives have to offer are ulterior motives and austerity. They want to cut, cut, cut.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, taxes, inflation and grocery prices are what we are going to cut.

The leader of the “Liberal Bloc” struck a very different tone today compared to what he said after the finance minister's most recent bad Liberal budget. Here is what the leader of the Bloc Québécois said about the Prime Minister: “I believe he has his hand in Quebecers' pockets. ...He is blatantly abusing his spending power. ...he is racking up an appalling deficit that Quebecers will be paying off for a long time to come”.

Why is the “Liberal Bloc” continuing to allow this Prime Minister to pick the pockets of Quebecers? Will the Prime Minister and his lieutenant from Beloeil—Chambly allow Quebecers to choose their government, a common-sense government, tomorrow?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always confident that Quebecers understand what does and does not make sense. What they just heard makes no sense.

We have been there for Quebec as a government. We have made exemplary investments in aerospace, record investments in aluminum, investments in the automotive sector and investments in digital technology. We are fighting to create jobs at home. We are fighting to build the industry of tomorrow. We are fighting to build the Quebec and Canada of tomorrow. That is what Quebecers expect.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, all that for this.

For a year now, Quebec has been demanding a fair distribution of asylum seekers among the provinces. Today, the Minister of Immigration announced that this was not going to happen and that his task force is disbanding. There will be no distribution, except with the two voluntary provinces, Newfoundland and Labrador and Manitoba. I want to thank both these provinces for understanding that forcing Quebec to take in asylum seekers from across Canada is creating a humanitarian crisis. Their efforts are appreciated, but they are not enough.

How can the minister accept such a colossal failure?

• (1445)

[English]

Mr. Paul Chiang (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I stand with the member opposite to help asylum seekers and put a roof over their heads. I understand the issue in Quebec. We are there for Quebecers and we are going to help them fix this problem.

[Translation]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, together, Newfoundland and Labrador and Manitoba represent 5% of the Canadian population. If they do their part, Quebec will still only be relieved of 5% of the burden of welcoming asylum seekers. Neither Quebecers nor asylum seekers will notice a difference in the availability of services. Every province must be involved. Quebecers should not have to look after all of Canada's asylum seekers on behalf of Canadians.

What is the minister going to do to stop Canada from dumping its responsibilities in Quebec's backyard?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that immigration and citizenship are federal responsibilities, and we work with the provinces and territories. If citizenship were under provincial jurisdiction, that would be a different story, but Canada is still a country.

The good news is that we are working very closely and effectively with the Quebec government on numerous immigration and asylum seeker issues, and things are going very well. Obviously, when things are going well and getting better, that is not so good for the Bloc Québécois.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the four Conservative provinces that refuse to help Quebec. These Conservatives, who have never done their part, refuse to take in a single extra person; meanwhile, Quebec is welcoming half of Canada's asylum seekers. Has anyone ever heard the federal Conservatives ask their buddies to help Quebecers? We certainly have not.

Does the minister think that the federal Conservatives should spend more time here in the House telling their buddies to help out with asylum seekers and less time in Florida creationist churches speaking out against abortion?

The Speaker: Once again, let me remind members that questions must pertain to the federal administration.

I see that the minister is rising to answer that question. I therefore recognize the hon. Minister of Public Services and Procurement.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while there is, indeed, much to say about the Conservatives' hidden agenda, I will leave it to the Conservatives to talk about their increasingly not-so-hidden hidden agenda.

We will talk about something more relevant to members from Quebec, at least in the context of the question, and that is the relationship with the Government of Quebec. Over the past few weeks, we have made three almost consecutive collaborative immigration announcements about temporary foreign workers twice, and about international students several other times. This collaborative work will only get better as long as we work together.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up. It is reported that a mother living in a homeless encampment in London, Ontario, said, “I’m a mom of three and I’m homeless. I just want to get inside, into a warm place before winter, so I can get my kids back with me where they belong.” Tomorrow, on behalf of all Canadians, there is a chance to break down this costly government, so we can build the homes they need.

Will the NDP-Liberal government let Canadians decide on a carbon tax election?

The Speaker: I would like to remind the member from Timmins—James Bay, and all members, to only take the floor when recognized by the Chair.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities.

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whether it is my community of London, Ontario, or any Canadian community, where homelessness exists, it is unacceptable. It is a tragic situation. Encampments should not exist. When the Conservatives stand up and raise these points, they do a good thing. What is not good is that they do not have a plan. It is all a sideshow. It is an act on the other side. They do not care about people who are on the street. If they did, they would have something to say on the matter of homelessness. Instead, they use people who are homeless as props here in the House of Commons. Conservative members will film them in encampments and post on social media, but they have no plan. They do not care.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, homelessness is up and tent encampments are up. In fact, homelessness is up 38% in Canada. There are now 1,400 tent encampments in Ontario alone. Liberal photo ops will not build the 5.8 million homes that are needed to restore housing affordability in Canada. Tomorrow, there is a chance to break down the costly government on behalf of all Canadians, so we can build the homes they need.

Will the NDP-Liberal government let Canadians decide on a carbon tax election?

• (1450)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I work with that member on the House of Commons committee responsible for housing. I know she is sincere when she raises these points, but the member's party has no plan. In fact, every

Oral Questions

single member on the opposite side said no when they had a chance to vote in favour of measures to confront the challenge of homelessness and the crisis that we see on our streets. They said no to more supports for communities. They said no to more supports for not-for-profits. There have been 87,000 people taken off the street as a result of investments we have made. We have more to do, and we will do it.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and, yes, now their time is up. The capital gains tax is yet another job-killing tax on small businesses. Liberals will say it only applies to the top 0.13%, but the finance minister will not say that it will not apply to the bottom 99.87%. Tomorrow, the NDP and Bloc have a chance to bring down the costly government by voting for our Conservative non-confidence motion.

Will the NDP and Bloc finally let Canadians decide in a carbon tax election?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government believes in tax fairness for all Canadians. We believe that a Canadian teacher or nurse should not be paying tax at a higher rate than a multi-millionaire. We believe that, in Canada, we should not be able to tell the size of someone's paycheque by their smile. We believe that no teenage girl in Canada should get pregnant because she cannot afford contraceptives. The way we pay for those essential programs is through tax fairness, but we know the only thing that Conservatives stand for is a hidden agenda of cuts and austerity.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up. Last week, we learned that the Parole Board of Canada granted day parole to a serial rapist who was convicted in 2020 for assaulting five women. The Parole Board is appointed by the Liberal government. The chair of the board answers to the Liberal public safety minister.

Oral Questions

When will the NDP-Liberals start locking up repeat violent offenders?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite knows well that the Parole Board's decisions are independent of government. What is sad is that the Conservatives would rather politicize the independence of our judicial system in order to create fear and to fearmonger for their own political gain. They want to undermine our democratic institutions for political gain. All Canadians should be very concerned about the Conservatives, their plans and their cuts to our criminal justice system.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, in Alberta, Conservative cuts to health care have left hundreds of thousands of Albertans without a family doctor, and it is getting worse. Fifty-eight per cent of Alberta doctors are planning to leave the province in the next five years. The Conservative plan to privatize health care is forcing Canadians to choose between waiting for the care they need and paying out of pocket. Albertans are Canadians too, and the Canada Health Act is supposed to protect all Canadians.

Why do the Liberals sit back while Danielle Smith cuts health care for Canadians?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that, for the member opposite and for every member of this caucus, the universal public nature of our health care system is essential. It is critical to make sure that every Canadian everywhere has access to care based on need, not based on the size of their bank account. That is why the threat of Conservative cuts, the attacks they want to make on our health system, are so menacing. It is why the House must work collaboratively to ensure that we get it done. That is why the investment of \$200 billion over the next 10 years in our health system is also critically important.

● (1455)

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I hope the health minister heeds his words as he looks at taking dental care away from Canadians. The Liberal Minister of Procurement recently threatened Canadians, on TV, saying that the government will take away dental care if it does not get its way. It would not be the first time Liberals let Canadians down. Together with Conservatives, they voted no to lowering grocery prices; they voted no to making big grocers pay what they owe, and they voted no to removing profit from long-term care. We know Conservatives will take away dental care from Canadians while they keep theirs.

Why are the Liberals threatening to do the same?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member will well know that the only party that is threatening dental care in this country is the Conservative Party of Canada, whose members refuse to answer a question. It is the only one I am aware of. When one refuses to answer a question, we can fill in the blanks, right? They want to cut it. First, they tried to say it did not exist, then they said that nobody would sign up for it—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please.

I invite the hon. minister to continue and finish his answer.

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, 750,000 have signed up so far. The path forward is clear. There are nine million Canadians who need to be served. There are nine million Canadians who did not have coverage. There are nine million people who the Conservatives do not believe deserve dental care. Well, we do, and we are not going to rest or stop until everyone is covered.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, reports of online child sexual abuse rose by 850% in the past 10 years in Canada. Our kids deserve better. As a father of three young daughters, I am worried about the dangers that lurk online and the lack of robust online safety laws to ensure the protection of our children, who are often at a vulnerable and impressionable age.

Can the Minister of Justice please share how he plans to keep our children safe online?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, parents across Canada are worried about their children's safety online. As a parent, I share their fear. That is why it is crucial that we implement laws dedicated to keeping our kids safe. That is why I introduced the online harms act. Bill C-63 introduces the first-ever safety standards for online platforms. It couples duties to protect kids with significant penalties for platforms that do not comply.

We have rigorous safety laws to protect our kids from harm in the physical world; they need to be safe online as well. We are creating a safer online world for our kids. It is really unfortunate that Conservatives cannot get onside with this important legislation.

* * *

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment's order is an affront to the regions of Quebec. It is another attempt by Ottawa to interfere in Quebec's jurisdictions. At least 1,400 jobs are in jeopardy. That means entire communities are at risk. The Conservatives understand that the impact will be disastrous.

Oral Questions

Tomorrow, on behalf of all Canadians and Quebeckers, we will have the opportunity to put an end to this centralist government.

Will the “Liberal Bloc” allow Quebeckers to have their say during an election?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no plan for the environment, no plan for air quality, no plan for clean air, no plan for the economy, no plan for health care, that is what the Conservatives have to offer Quebeckers.

We are working with everyone to try to find solutions to problems that can be quite complex. We just made an offer to the Government of Quebec worth nearly half a billion dollars. We will work together to find a solution for the forestry jobs, but also for protecting the caribou, which the Conservatives are incapable of doing.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Minister of Environment that no amount of money can compensate for lost jobs, shattered lives and a social crisis. That is what the order is going to cause in my region.

What the Bloc Québécois calls a gain is actually a temporary measure until Christmas. We know that the Bloc Québécois is no longer a party of the regions. It is important to understand that the only possible gain for Quebec is to bring down the Liberals.

Will the “Liberal Bloc” let Quebeckers decide in an election?

• (1500)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think tomorrow's vote in the House will actually reveal that the House does not have confidence in the Leader of the Opposition. He has nothing to offer the people of Quebec, whether in terms of the environment, the economy or jobs. He has nothing to offer—zero, *niet*.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have an opportunity to end the most costly and centralist government in this country's history. This government is doing Quebec a lot of harm, as François Legault, the Premier of Quebec, rightly pointed out last week.

The “Liberal Bloc” has kept supporting this government, which is going to kill at least 1,400 jobs in Saguenay and on the north shore. It is a catastrophe waiting to happen.

Why not call an election and let forestry workers decide their own future?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that three elections have taken place in Canada since 2015, and the environment was central to discussions and debates across the country each time. We won all three elections. They may not be pleased about that.

What we are going to see in the House tomorrow is that the House has no confidence in the Leader of the Opposition. The House does not trust the Conservative Party, which is there to protect the interests of its friends, not the people of Canada.

Whether on the economy, the environment or jobs, the Conservatives have nothing to offer.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, members of the House and all Canadians are well aware that this government is always quick to lecture everyone about the environment, but it is “do as I say, not as I do”.

According to The National Post, the Prime Minister caused \$200,000 in environmental damage with this jet this summer, this government has not met any targets in the past nine years, and Canada is ranked 63 out of 67 countries on the effectiveness of its environmental measures.

However, the Liberal government has no need to worry, because it will get help from its Bloc Québécois friends. This sovereignist party is going to help a federalist party. How can the minister, who is a staunch federalist, go along with that?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague opposite, but unfortunately, almost everything he said is untrue.

Greenhouse gas emissions are the lowest they have been in 25 years. This is the first time in the history of the country that emissions have dropped while the economy is firing on all cylinders. The last time emissions were this low, O.J. Simpson was before the courts and the iPhone had been invented but not yet put on the market.

The Conservatives have no plan to address climate change and are not proposing any adaptation measures, when that cost Canadians \$7 billion this summer.

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleagues can guess whose emails and documents the Liberals are trying to hide from Quebeckers. It is Amira Elghawaby. Yes, her again.

The Information Commissioner had to issue an order forcing the department that she works for to respond to an access-to-information request for 3,000 pages of emails and documents. Ms. Elghawaby is not a minister, though. She has no confidential strategic information.

Seriously, what does Ms. Elghawaby have to hide? Why are the Liberals so afraid to release these emails and documents to the public?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all government organizations, all departments, all Crown corporations and all agents working for the Canadian government have the same responsibility to respect the Access to Information Act, and that is what is expected in this case too.

Oral Questions

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are not learning much from the minister's answers. We are not going to learn much from Mrs. Elghawaby's emails either.

We do not understand why the Liberals refuse to disclose them to the public. At best, we will find out what she wrote and to whom. We might find out what group she consults, but that is not likely. We might find out what she really thinks, unfiltered, about a few other things. We can agree that we do not expect anything very edifying.

Honestly, if the Liberals are so afraid of the public finding out what she writes and whom she talks to, then why wait until it comes out in the papers? Why not dismiss her immediately and abolish her position?

• (1505)

[English]

Hon. Kamal Khara (Minister of Diversity, Inclusion and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely committed to an open and transparent government. The request will be released ahead of the extension and given to the Information Commissioner.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, costs are up, taxes are up, crime is up, time is up and now tariffs are up. The U.S. softwood lumber tariffs have just doubled. What does the Prime Minister do? Does he make trade headlines? No, he is not making headlines; he is making punchlines on late-night TV where he called the softwood lumber issue a small issue that matters. It is 400,000 jobs.

When is the Prime Minister going to figure out that he is the punchline and that it is time for a prime minister who will make this a large issue that matters for all Canadians, their jobs and their paycheques?

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am really glad that the member opposite yesterday saw the Prime Minister's appearance on Stephen Colbert, especially since we know that they get their news from Tucker Carlson.

Canadians who watched last night's interview will know what all Canadians know: The government stands up for our workers, we stand up for our forestry sector and we will continue to do this work for Canadians and for our workers. The forestry sector contributes enormous jobs to this country, and we will keep doing that work.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, lame excuses are also up. The last prime minister solved the softwood lumber deal in 80 days. It has been nine years. The last prime minister did not back down, but the current Prime Minister backs down to Biden, to Obama and to Trump, and the result has been increased unemployment and the risk of another 400,000 jobs in the forestry sector.

When the Prime Minister said that Canada was back, he meant "backed down". Is it not time for a prime minister who will stand up for Canadians once again?

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to securing trade deals, we are not going to take any lessons from the Conservatives. The Conservative Party wants us to ignore the environment. It wants us to ignore workers. It wants us to sign bad trade deals. I remember that in the House the Conservatives wanted us to capitulate on CUSMA. We did not do that. They cheered on Brexit. We did not do that. They abandoned Ukrainians when they needed it the most and when we negotiated free trade agreements.

On this side of the House, we negotiate good deals, not just any deals, and we will not capitulate.

The Speaker: The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets has been on the Hill for a long time. I ask for his indulgence.

The hon. member from Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies has the floor.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and their time is up. The Prime Minister was on a U.S. talk show last night and dismissed his failures on softwood lumber as a small issue. This was weeks after the U.S. slapped Canada with a 14.5% tariff on softwood lumber. Since then, two more B.C. mills have closed, putting 500 more workers out of a job.

Do the NDP-Liberals really think mills closing and the loss of thousands of forestry jobs is just a small issue?

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the softwood lumber industry and its workers for the tremendous contribution they make to the Canadian economy. We heard the Prime Minister say this, and we are talking about this. The long-term dispute does not help anybody, and in particular it does not help us build affordable homes.

On this side of the House, we are really proud that we are tackling housing and are building affordable homes. If we are to solve this issue, it will make housing affordability better in the United States and certainly better here in Canada.

[Translation]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a very important event took place this summer, specifically the opening of an elementary school in the Atikamekw community of Manawan. This school, funded in part by the federal government, will enable the community's children to study their own culture and in their own language. This is very good news.

I would like the Minister of Indigenous Services to update the House on the efforts our government is making to support education for young people in indigenous communities.

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pontiac for her work on access to education. Since 2016, we have increased funding for education by 80%. Budget 2024 will help us build and renovate more than 200 schools in first nations communities for 35,000 students. The evidence is clear. Students are more motivated when they see themselves reflected in their learning.

* * *

• (1510)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up. Last night, the Prime Minister appeared on *The Late Show* to pathetically explain why he keeps backing down to American presidents regarding softwood lumber. He called his failure regarding softwood lumber a small issue. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of forestry workers have lost their job. It is an insult to them.

After nine years of repeatedly backing down to each and every president with respect to softwood lumber, how can Canadians believe they will ever get a deal to lift the punishing tariffs?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has stood up to Trump and the government has stood up to Putin. Meanwhile, when Putin told the Conservatives to vote against the free trade deal with Ukraine, they said, “okay, fine”, and when Trump threatened Canada with section 232 tariffs against steel and aluminum, we stood up to the U.S.

Do members know what the Conservatives said? They said that was dumb, and they told us to back down. We did not. We will never back down to bullies. We will always stand up for Canadians.

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is pathetic. That comes from the government that allowed Canadian detonators to end up in Russian land mines that blew up Ukrainian troops.

The Liberals are a disgrace. They backed down to Trump regarding softwood. They backed down from Obama regarding softwood. They backed down to Biden regarding softwood. After nine years of complete and total failure, tens of thousands of forestry workers

Oral Questions

have lost their job. The minister did not even address it, and her Prime Minister insulted them by saying it is a small issue.

We know that the arrogant Prime Minister will not apologize to the forestry workers. Will he let them judge him in a carbon tax election?

The Speaker: Once again, I invite members to be very prudent and judicious in their choice of words.

The hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has the floor.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when our country faced an existential economic challenge, the threat that our free trade agreement with the United States would be torn up, our government stood up to the U.S., and the Conservatives ran scared. The Conservatives told us to back down.

When the U.S. imposed illegal section 232 tariffs on our steel and aluminum, we stood up for Canadians. We imposed countervailing tariffs. The Conservatives told us to back down.

Canadians remember that. We will never back down. We stand up for—

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to defending jobs, we would never tell anybody to back down. Only the Prime Minister does that.

After nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and its time is up. Last night, the Prime Minister told Stephen Colbert that his failure to negotiate a deal on softwood lumber and fisheries was a small issue. Canadian companies have paid the U.S. over \$9 billion in tariffs. There are 800,000 direct and indirect jobs on the line. The forestry sector is in a crisis, yet the Prime Minister has backed down time and time again to three different presidents.

Why does the Prime Minister show so much disdain to Canadian workers?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is only one party in the House that shows disdain to Canadian workers, and it is the Conservative Party of Canada.

Time and time again, when our country has had to negotiate trade deals, the current government has stood for Canadians. We renegotiated NAFTA. We stood up against the U.S. steel and aluminum tariffs, and we will continue to stand up for Canadian workers in all sectors, including the forestry sector.

What is up is time for the Conservatives to stop playing political games and get down to the serious business of governing this country. That is what Canadians expect. It is time for them to grow up.

Routine Proceedings

● (1515)

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago today, my region braced as hurricane Fiona made landfall. In the aftermath, we learned that the vicious storm had destroyed homes, reshaped our coastlines and, most tragically, had taken lives. The resilience of Islanders and all Atlantic Canadians became apparent afterwards, as we all came together as neighbours to support each other.

On this sombre anniversary, I would like to ask the minister what ACOA has done to support our region to rebuild, recover and thrive in the wake of this deadly disaster.

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, because when his community was hurting, he was there to help, and the government was also there to help our region get back on its feet.

Through the hurricane Fiona recovery fund, ACOA delivered over \$300 million to support shellfish producers and farmers, and we rebuilt small craft harbours, repaired damage in our national parks and set up comfort centres for communities to be ready for the next climate event.

We will always step up and have each other's back. It was true two years ago and is still true today: We are stronger than the storm.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Environment called out the Conservatives for holding a fundraiser with oil and gas executives, which would be great except that the Liberals, over the past year, have met with oil and gas lobbyists five times a day. It is no wonder that the Liberals continue to water down key climate policies and hand out billions in subsidies. CEOs, like Suncor's Rich Kruger, have never had it so good. On top of all that, they bought him a pipeline.

When will the Liberals put a hard cap on emissions, close the loopholes in the industrial carbon price and make big polluters pay what they owe?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote from the member for Victoria: "The carbon tax is a crucial piece of a climate plan". I would like to read another quote from the member for Victoria: "the PBO has put out a number of reports that confirm...that 80% of Canadians get more money back than they pay." This is a fact that the Conservatives continue to ignore.

I think there are a lot of people out there who are very concerned about climate change, who are wondering what is happening with the NDP and who are very disappointed with the fact that the NDP, faced with pressure from the Conservatives and with lies and misinformation, caved. We will not cave on this side of the House.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Liberal price of pollution. We now learn that

taxpayers were hit up for \$1,200 per household to get the TMX boondoggle built. That is a direct subsidy from Canadians' pockets to Suncor, and the Prime Minister, the "sunny ways" man, is responsible for the biggest increases in oil production and emissions in history. No wonder Richie Rich Kruger from Suncor says the sun is shining on the tar sands, sunny ways while our planet burns.

Will the environment minister at least admit to the world that he had no intention of ever dealing with emissions when he went to COP? He was there to be the front for Suncor and Imperial.

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we have seen yet another drop in emissions on a pathway. We are on track to achieve the emissions reductions that we have committed to by 2030 to the international community.

I do think that many are very concerned about the NDP's backing away from having any credible policy with respect to climate change. Its flip-flop at the behest of the Conservative Party leader on carbon pricing is amazing. The member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie said, "as New Democrats, as progressives, as environmentalists, we are in favour of putting a price on pollution." I guess they are no longer progressive or environmentalists.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

The House resumed from September 23 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:19 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Call in the members.

● (1530)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 857)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Ali	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo
Carr	Carrie
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Chambers	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dalton
Damoff	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desbiens
Desjais	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Epp	Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferri
Findlay	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Gallant
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genius
Gerretsen	Gill
Glada	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Gray
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hallan
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Hoback

Routine Proceedings

Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Jeneroux
Jivani	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Kelly
Khalid	Khanna
Khera	Kitchen
Kmiec	Koutrakis
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lantsman	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lawrence
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Majumdar
Maloney	Martel
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
McLeod	McPherson
Melillo	Mendès
Medicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Muys
Naqvi	Nater
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Rota	Ruff
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schiefke	Schmale
Seeback	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Small	Sorbara
Soroka	Sousa

Business of Supply

Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Tochor
Tolmie	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williams	Williamson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zimmer
Zuberi— 327	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded division, Government Orders will be extended by 12 minutes.

[*English*]

I also wish to inform the House that the volume of earpieces will now be reset. Members using their earpieces at this time will have to readjust the volume.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I was hoping to address this to the Speaker, as the NDP is waiting for a ruling from him on the member for Carleton's comments last Thursday, which are still on the record. They clearly went over the line of what is acceptable in this House. Standing Order 18 very clearly states that disrespectful and offensive language against a fellow member of Parliament is not permitted.

As we have made very clear, we expect and are waiting for a full apology and withdrawal from the member for Carleton. We have not yet seen that from the Speaker's office.

• (1535)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is duly noted. I am sure there will be a response soon.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CONFIDENCE IN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE GOVERNMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to today's opposition day motion on behalf of the residents of my amazing riding of Davenport, in downtown west Toronto. It is not a surprise that I will not be supporting this motion when it comes to a vote. I want to talk about the work the Liberals are doing to strengthen the economy here in Canada and, more specifically, the investments we are making in artificial intelligence.

Today, I rise to highlight this government's achievements on artificial intelligence. Artificial intelligence has incredible potential to transform the economy, improve the way we work and enhance our way of life. Over the last several years, our federal government has taken a number of actions to support our world-class researchers and innovators to ensure that Canada remains at the forefront of developing and adopting safe and responsible artificial intelligence.

When it comes to artificial intelligence, Canada has been ahead of the curve for many years. In 2017, Canada was the first country to launch a fully funded national AI strategy. Through the pan-Canadian AI strategy, we have helped build a vibrant AI ecosystem in Canada by working with key partners such as the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research; the three national AI institutes based across this country in Edmonton, Montreal and Toronto; and Canada's five global innovation clusters to build a base of world-class talent in AI, to advance research excellence and to drive the responsible adoption of AI across Canada's economy and society.

Through the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research AI chairs program, we have recruited over 120 of the best and brightest AI researchers in the world. These researchers are advancing research in a range of key areas such as science, health, energy and the environment. We are also training a strong cohort of next-generation AI leaders. Through the second phase of this strategy, we are building a strong research base with programs that are enabling AI commercialization and adoption.

Business of Supply

The investments made by our federal government of over \$440 million under the strategy have resulted in a research and talent ecosystem that is the envy of the world. We are seeing the positive economic impacts of investments in the growing number of AI start-ups and scale-ups across Canada that are taking world-leading positions in their fields. Canada now ranks among leading nations on the global AI index, as well as in start-up AI activity, venture capital investment in AI companies, talent growth and research publications.

Furthermore, in 2018, the federal government launched the global innovation clusters program, including Canada's AI-powered supply chains cluster, Scale AI, representing an ambitious co-investment with industry. Scale AI is creating collaborations across the country to promote intellectual property creation and commercialization and to ensure that Canada's AI business ecosystem remains one of the most vibrant in the world.

• (1540)

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I was listening intently to my colleague's speech, which is on a confidence motion about the Prime Minister and the government, and I have yet to hear whether she has confidence related to the motion at hand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows there is a lot of latitude in what members can address in their speeches, and the hon. member for Davenport is talking about the government's actions.

The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is rising on the same point of order.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I know it is extremely unusual that I would rise to support a point made by my friend from Battle River—Crowfoot, but I do think we should try for some relevance.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Davenport.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, to the first hon. member who mentioned me, first of all, I am glad he listened so intently, but he missed the intentional indication that I made at the outset of my speech that I will not be supporting the opposition day motion. I believe we are talking about confidence in this government, and I would say that I have enormous confidence in our government. I am giving the member examples of why I have so much confidence in it and am talking about our AI strategy. I see all of this as very relevant and I am going to continue.

In 2018, the government launched the global innovation cluster program. This program is an ambitious coinvestment with industry that will create collaborations across the country to promote intellectual property creation and commercialization and to ensure that we have a very strong AI business ecosystem that will remain the most vibrant in the world. I believe we have a lot of work to do to create a culture of IP here in Canada, and we need to continue to invest very strongly in IP education and make sure we are patenting and trademarking the unbelievable ideas created here in Canada.

Going back to Canada's AI, to date, Scale AI has announced 151 projects representing a total coinvestment of \$610 million. These

projects have helped Canadian start-ups launch new products, find partners and grow. Scale AI has supported many Canadian AI successes, such as Routific in B.C. and AlayaCare in Montreal. With many more projects under way, Scale AI will continue to deliver on the promise of advancing AI innovation and driving economic growth across Canada.

As our domestic AI capacity has grown, Canada has leveraged this to shape global norms on AI. With France, we developed and launched the Global AI Partnership on AI in 2020, which is now the premier forum where countries can collaborate and advance the development of AI for good and for all. With allies in the Council of Europe, we developed the first binding treaty to ensure the respect of human rights, the rule of law and democracy in the use of AI. With G7 allies, Canada has developed cutting-edge principles and best practices for responsible AI.

This experience allowed Canada to be an early mover in developing clearer rules for developing and operating AI systems. In 2022, our Minister of Innovation tabled Bill C-27, which included a component entitled the artificial intelligence and data act. If passed, it will make a new law aimed at ensuring proper risk management and transparency for AI systems in order to promote trust. This act would ensure that firms developing or deploying AI systems play critical roles in the lives of Canadians, such as those determining access to credit or employment, and that they meet the minimum standards for transparency, assessment and mitigation of risk. This will ensure that Canadians can trust these systems to operate safely and fairly. The act would also create a new regulator, the artificial intelligence and data commissioner, to oversee compliance, with strong penalties for non-compliance. Canada was one of the first countries in the world to introduce comprehensive AI legislation, and many other countries are now going down the same path and following our leadership.

Business of Supply

With the advances of generative AI that took place in 2022 and 2023, our federal government took action to ensure that businesses have the tools they need to adopt advanced AI in a trustworthy and responsible manner. Our government introduced a voluntary code of conduct on advanced generative AI. This code is voluntary, and those who sign on to it commit to set in place concrete measures, which include expectations for AI transparency, safety, accountability and testing. To date, 30 organizations have signed on to the code, and we expect more signatories in the future.

Most recently, our government continued its leadership in this space through budget 2024, which announced an ambitious package of measures totalling \$2.4 billion over five years, starting in 2024-25, to secure Canada's AI advantage. This includes \$2 billion in funding for a new AI compute access fund and an AI sovereign compute strategy, \$200 million to support the adoption of AI across Canada's economy and \$100 million to support small and medium-sized enterprises that are seeking to develop and scale their AI product offerings.

• (1545)

I want to finish off by saying that we have laid a strong foundation for future successes to come with the strategy and investment we have made in AI, and with the support we are putting into place for our world-class researchers. What we are doing now is doubling down on investments in compute and adoption and upscaling to make sure Canada remains at the forefront of the AI revolution. We are proud of the work we have done to support Canada's AI ecosystem and proud of the work we are doing to protect Canadians as we enter into the digital and AI-enabled age.

I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to this important motion today on behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport.

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an interesting fact that food bank usage across this great country has reached its highest peak ever. In Ontario alone, one million people visited a food bank in one year, and across Canada, there were almost two million visits to food banks in one month.

I wonder if the member opposite has any comments on the failure of the government to deliver on reduced taxes and better affordability for Canadian citizens.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his concern about food banks. Indeed, the fact that we have more people going to food banks is a huge concern in Canada, and we are rightly concerned about this. However, I am very proud of our government. Every step of the way, we have introduced a number of measures to help support Canadians at every level of income. We have introduced the Canada child benefit. We have lowered taxes for the middle class and those working hard to achieve it. We have introduced a dental care plan. We have introduced a national child care plan. We have introduced a number of programs to help support Canadians through this process. The only question I have is why Conservatives have voted against each one of those programs.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I imagine that it will come as no surprise to my colleague that I am

talking to her about seniors. According to the OECD, Canada is one of the industrialized countries where people experience the sharpest drop in their purchasing power on retirement. Based on these data, would my colleague not agree that the Bloc Québécois's request is extremely reasonable?

Even though they say it would cost \$3 billion, the fact remains that this does not even represent 1% of government spending. Is it not reasonable to say that seniors, who built Quebec and the rest of this country, deserve to be treated decently?

[*English*]

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, there is a huge number of seniors in my riding of Davenport. I love them all, and I am very fond of them. First of all, I am always in support of more support for seniors, just to let everybody know, but I am very proud of our record in the House. One of the first things we did when we were first elected is lower the age of retirement from 67 to 65. We increased the guaranteed income for seniors, and we also provided an increase of 10% to OAS for those 75 and older. We have provided a significant amount of housing dollars that will support additional housing specifically for seniors. We have also introduced the national dental care plan, which is adored by seniors, not only in Davenport but right across this country.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, when we look at the Canadian electorate right now, I think we can see that about 60% of Canadians are rejecting what the Conservatives are trying to sell, but that 60% is looking for a progressive standard-bearer. I think it is fair to say, with the by-election losses in Toronto—St. Paul's and recently in Montreal, that there is a big sense of disappointment in the Liberal government, particularly in the Prime Minister. Canadians are looking for bold ideas on tackling climate change, on tackling corporate greed, and they have yet to see that. Canadians really are hurting.

There were rumblings in the Liberal caucus at the start of summer about confidence in the Prime Minister. Does this member still have confidence in her leader to actually step up to the plate and meet the moment that Canadians are asking for?

• (1550)

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, this will be the third time I am indicating that I will not be supporting this motion and I have full confidence in our Prime Minister and his role as leader of our Liberal Party.

Business of Supply

I am glad that the member mentioned carbon pricing and innovative, creative ideas. That was a creative idea that we introduced when we were first elected in office almost nine years ago. Carbon pricing, a price on pollution, is a very innovative idea. It is the most effective and efficient way of reducing emissions, and I am very sorry that the New Democrats have decided to join the Conservatives and not support carbon pricing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to start by mentioning that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston. I am here today to speak about our non-confidence motion regarding this Prime Minister and this government. It is often said that memory is not infallible. What we know today, thanks to our short-term memory, is that this government, with the help of the Bloc Québécois, has doubled the country's debt, doubled the cost of housing, caused the worst inflation in 40 years, sent two million people to food banks, and unleashed a wave of crime and chaos in our communities. That is today's reality.

I think we need a reminder, a refresher on this government's legacy over the past nine years. There are reasons why we say "nine years with this Prime Minister" or "nine years with this government". I want to talk about the current legacy of scandals surrounding the Prime Minister. The list is long. I hope I will have enough time to get through it all.

For starters, we remember the infamous trip to the Aga Khan's island; that was a controversial trip. There was even a report from the Ethics Commissioner, who found the Prime Minister guilty of ethical breaches. Then there is the former justice minister, Jody Wilson-Raybould, a woman of integrity who wanted to do her job but was sidelined because she would not help SNC-Lavalin circumvent the law.

There was the WE Charity scandal. Everyone remembers WE, and if they do not, that is exactly why we need to talk about it again. Some \$900 million was spent via this company for gatherings of some kind. Money was also paid out to relatives. I am talking about the Prime Minister's mother and brother. I could go on and on about that scandal, but today I simply want to refresh everyone's memory.

Let us talk about management of the pandemic. What did Canada do? In a truly baffling decision, we took our stockpile of masks and personal protective equipment and sent it to China. What happened a few weeks later? The virus entered Canada, and we were out of equipment because it had all been sent to China. That is the kind of utterly ridiculous decision that was made. Meanwhile, contracts were being signed. Because there was a pandemic, things had to be done. Party insiders close to the regime were rubbing their hands in glee, including former MP Frank Baylis, who owned a company and announced that he could provide 10,000 ventilators for \$230 million. Someone looked at that, scratched their head and thought that 10,000 ventilators seemed like a lot, that maybe we did not need that many and that it would have cost \$130 million on the market. Overpaying by \$100 million is not insignificant. He was a party insider, however. We dug a little deeper and tried to figure things out at committee, but we were not able to truly get to the

bottom of this. In hindsight, we know that it made no sense whatsoever. To make matters worse, I was recently told that these 10,000 machines have been thrown in the garbage.

Last spring, there was the McKinsey affair. Dominic Barton and friends of the Prime Minister and the Liberal regime were suddenly awarded contracts worth over \$120 million. Contracts were awarded to McKinsey for consulting. Once again, in committee, we dug a little deeper to get the information. We all know that those contracts did not make any sense, but it is difficult to press charges. However, Canadians should remember that these things happened and that there are still a lot of unanswered questions.

With respect to the Governor General issue, the appointment of Ms. Payette was a total fiasco. Everyone knows that things went completely off the rails there. She spent money frivolously. Victims had to be compensated. In our opinion, that appointment and that mindset are representative of the Prime Minister's legacy. In 2021, the current Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs admitted that the "Payette fiasco shows the need for a stronger GG vetting process". What did the Prime Minister immediately do to replace Ms. Payette? He appointed a Governor General who does not speak French, one of the official languages. I think that we need to repeat that often: Our official languages are English and French.

That was another really stupid decision on the part of this government. The Liberals had the opportunity to appoint a new governor general and they chose a unilingual anglophone. Let us also remember our Prime Minister's much-talked-about trip to India in 2018. What a fiasco that was. It was totally ridiculous. He was wearing costumes. He made us the laughingstock of the country, but things got even worse from there.

● (1555)

When he attended an official protocol activity in India, there was a terrorist in his group. That terrorist had been invited by a former MP who is no longer here today, fortunately. That terrorist was a guest of Canada. That is quite something.

We know that the Prime Minister likes to dress up. Even before he became Prime Minister, he often wore racist costumes. He did it so often that he does not even remember how many times he did it.

I want to come back to the financial scandals. Recently, there was the ArriveCAN scandal, the famous app that should have cost \$80,000. Experts said they could develop that app in a week-end. In the end, it cost us taxpayers \$60 million and counting. That is another scandal. As I was saying at the start, it has been nine years of scandals. Some apparently end up being forgotten. That is why today, when we talk about how this is the situation after nine years, we add this all up.

Business of Supply

I will move on to the partisan judicial appointments. That is a sensitive topic. The fact remains that it is common knowledge that six sitting superior court judges paid to have drinks with the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance just before being appointed to the bench.

Let us get back to the trips. There was the Prime Minister's vacation at the home of the Aga Khan, and after that, there was his Jamaican holiday. The Prime Minister travelled to Jamaica with his family, and his team told the media that he was paying all of his own expenses. We know that the airplane is a must for security reasons. No one needs to tell me that. I know. As for the rest, however, when people decide to stay at a big villa and all that, they should pay for it themselves, not with taxpayer dollars. The Prime Minister's Office said that he paid for all of his expenses, but we later learned that he had not paid a cent, that he had been invited by another billionaire friend to stay at his home with his family and his entourage. Why not tell Canadians the truth? Why play all the angles all the time?

We agree that the Prime Minister is entitled to take a vacation with his family. There was a time when politicians could not go on vacation without being perceived as people who do no work. We agree that taking two or three weeks of vacation a year is normal. However, when prime ministers Chrétien, Martin, Mulroney and Harper took vacations, why did they not go to billionaires' islands, to the residences of other millionaires or billionaires or to Jamaica? They were happy with reasonable vacations. Why is this not important to the Prime Minister? He hops on the government jet and flies off to island paradises with no regard for Canadians. It is all sorts of things like that that led us to realize that we can no longer have confidence in someone who thinks that way.

More money was spent at Harrington Lake. The government decided to spend up to \$11 million to renovate the facilities at Harrington Lake, to move the guest house closer to the lake. The Prime Minister never goes there, though, so why invest \$11 million to move a guest house closer to the lake?

I will talk about other contracts and other weird decisions. Once again, these are sensitive issues. I need to point out that public money was used to hire consultants who are frankly racist. For example, Laith Marouf, who was known to be a raging anti-Semite, received \$500,000 from the government for work on racism. Why hire someone who is already known as a racist to do work that does not reflect his mandate? Another crazy decision was to hire Amira Elghawaby to build bridges. Before she was hired, we already knew that she was making racist comments about Quebeckers, among others. Now that she has been appointed, she continues to create disruption instead of building bridges. Why did they hire her, and why do they not fire her now?

I mentioned all these scandals to refresh everyone's memory, but let us not forget that, in today's economy, young people cannot even hope to own a home. Construction is at the same level as in the 1970s. An additional \$500 billion in budgetary allocations were adopted, unfortunately with the support of the Bloc Québécois. Canada has the worst growth in the G7. The Prime Minister and his government have spent more than all other prime ministers in Canadian history combined.

• (1600)

It is a long list, and I am running out of time, but we are simply reminding members why we no longer have confidence in this government.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the issue is where the problem lies. The Conservatives' focus is more on character assassination than anything else.

When the member talks about reviewing the government over the last eight years, he does not refer to things like how no government in the history of Canada has signed off on more trade agreements. When we look at jobs, Stephen Harper created one million jobs, versus two million jobs in the same time frame. We can talk about inflation and working with Canadians; Canada is doing exceptionally well on inflation today at 2%. We can talk about interest rates and how Canada is leading the way in decreases in interest rates.

Canada is not broken, contrary to the consistent messaging from the Conservatives. Why does the member not talk about the real issues affecting Canadians as opposed to nothing but cheap shots and character assassination?

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, my colleague from Abbotsford who sits behind me was the minister of international trade at the time, and he negotiated the free trade agreements. It was Conservative governments that negotiated most, if not nearly all, of the free trade agreements. What the Liberal government did was renew agreements that were originally negotiated by strong Conservative prime ministers who knew what they were talking about.

With regard to the economy, can my colleague explain why it is that we have to take all the GST Canadians pay, that is, \$50 billion a year, and send it to New York and London for interest payments because the country's debt has doubled under the current government?

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleagues talked a lot about scandals. I am not sure if it is a scandal or if I should question the Conservatives' word, but when Bill C-319 was at committee, the entire committee voted in favour of the bill. Now that things are getting much more serious with this bill, it seems like the Conservatives are getting cold feet.

Can the member assure me that the Conservatives are not getting cold feet and that they are in favour of increasing old age security for seniors aged 65 to 74?

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, we did support Bill C-319, but at the end of the day, the ball is in the government's court. We no longer have confidence in this government. We do not have confidence in the Prime Minister for a litany of reasons that I could have expanded on for 30 minutes.

I encourage my colleague to support our motion to defeat the government. Afterwards, we will sit down and figure out Quebec and Canada's future together.

• (1605)

[*English*]

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member raised partisan appointments. Right now, in the United States, women are dying and women are being charged with murder because of the results of partisan appointments reversing *Roe v. Wade*. That could happen here, if the Conservatives are appointing both senators and judges.

I want to ask the member a question. What is the Conservative position on the right to choose?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, I said it before and I will say it again. I can repeat it 100,000 times. We are not planning to touch women's rights. We have no plans to touch the right to abortion. We have been clear about that. The leader of the Conservative Party of Canada has been clear. He has said this publicly on many occasions.

The Liberals, the NDP, the Bloc Québécois and everyone can relax. We are not planning to touch those rights.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I find it odd to see this motion before the House today. Here is my question for my Conservative colleague: What does he think is the role of members in the House? Does he not think that it is to represent our constituents?

Does the official opposition not see that two provincial elections have already been called? All of the people in my riding are saying that the Conservative motion is a total joke.

Why now? Why are the Conservatives failing to respect elections and democracy at the provincial level when provincial elections are going on?

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my speech, memory is not infallible. I think the leader of the Green Party has forgotten that this Liberal government has been a disaster for nine years. For us, there is nothing new under the sun. We are not suddenly moving a motion to bring down the government. We have been saying for quite some time that this is not working. We have only just returned to the House, and it is time to call an election.

[*English*]

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Madam Speaker, four and a half years ago, on March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared a worldwide pandemic, the COVID-19 pandemic. Two days after that, the House of Commons suspended.

Business of Supply

About ten days after that, on March 24, it came back in an emergency session with the government's goal of passing a piece of legislation, which at that point had not been shared with the House of Commons, that would give the government, among other things, the power to suspend the House for a year and a half. Supply would be guaranteed to the government for over a year, until December 2021. The government would have the ability to pass new laws by regulations, which is known as a Henry VIII clause because Henry VIII did something similar in his reign 500-odd years ago. We would have seen the suspension of the system we call responsible government, in which the government of the day is responsible to the House of Commons, for a year and a half.

Those of us who were members of Parliament at that time were told to stay home, that it was too dangerous to come to Ottawa and we would be risking our own safety and the safety of others. A series of preposterous arguments was presented as to why we could not meet and how it would be dangerous. We could, of course, have met at the convention centre and been widely spaced; no trade shows were on at the time.

We needed unanimous consent to pass this bill in one shot, so I came here with the intention of denying unanimous consent if no one else would do it. As it turned out, that was not necessary because a number of my Conservative colleagues came here with the same intention, and that attempt to suspend responsible government was stopped. The House of Commons' ability to bring down the government, which would have been pushed through, was stopped.

At the time, I said I would come here one day and talk about the importance of the confidence convention, the history of it and the importance of responsible government. Today is that day.

Let me just read what I said on March 24, 2020. It is on my website:

Indeed, if we are to take our signs from the first draft of Bill C-13, which is to be introduced today..., it would appear that the Government's primary interest is in using the COVID-19 crisis to strip away any Parliamentary oversight whatever, between now and December 2021—twenty-one months in the future [as it then was]....

That contempt for democracy, for civil rights and for the traditions that make Canada the great place it is and give Canada its honoured place in the continuum of the world's great democracies has been the one consistent theme of the government throughout its entire life, starting with the 2015 election of the current Prime Minister and his fallacious, insincere, hypocritical promise that it would be the last election by first past the post. It turned out that it would be the last election by first past the post unless he was faced with the possibility of a system that was not his preferred system, which was preferential, a system that would systematically and predictably favour the Liberal Party. At any rate, here we are, and I want to talk today about the concept of non-confidence.

Business of Supply

The Westminster style of government, the model our ancestors would have called responsible government, was developed in near-synchronicity in the United Kingdom and in Britain's North American provinces in the fourth and fifth decades of the 19th century. This system started with a non-confidence vote that took place on November 15, 1830, in the Parliament of Westminster. That vote brought down the administration of the Duke of Wellington, the same Duke of Wellington who defeated Napoleon. The non-confidence vote of April 7, 1835, reinforced that principle, bringing down the government of Sir Robert Peel. This model was emulated in the province of Canada by Baldwin and LaFontaine in the 1840s and also in Nova Scotia, which became the very first jurisdiction in the world, other than the United Kingdom itself, to achieve responsible government.

I want to be clear about this. Through the ability to bring forward motions of confidence, or non-confidence, in the government of the day, responsible government was all about establishing whether the government of the day could or could not command a majority of votes in the elected lower House of Parliament or the legislature.

• (1610)

Here is how the bronze plaque outside Nova Scotia's house of assembly commemorates the event that took place in that jurisdiction:

The First Responsible Government in the British Empire
The first Executive Council—

That is the formal name in British colonies for what we call the cabinet.

—chosen exclusively from the party having a majority in the representative branch of a colonial legislature...on the 2nd February, 1848. Following a vote of want of confidence in the preceding Council, James Boyle Uniacke, who had moved the resolution, became Attorney General and leader of the Government [in other words, the premier]. Joseph Howe, who had long striven for this "Peaceable Revolution," became Provincial Secretary.

The principle that administrations could be replaced by means of non-confidence votes was adopted only a month later in the province of Canada, when the Baldwin-LaFontaine ministry was sworn in by the governor general, Lord Elgin. In New Brunswick, it was adopted in May of the same year.

As we can see from these examples, there was a time when it was normal practice for confidence motions to result in changes of government without an intervening election. However, that time has passed, and it has been the normal practice for well over a century for successful non-confidence motions to be followed by an election, with the voters being given the option to give their support in that election to the party that moved the non-confidence motion.

This, of course, is what happened in 2006, when a motion of non-confidence in the Liberal government of Paul Martin was followed by the election of Stephen Harper's Conservatives. The voters can also choose to reject the movers of the motion and reaffirm their support for the existing administration, which happened in 2011, when Stephen Harper was elected with an expanded mandate after losing a vote on a confidence motion in the House of Commons.

A motion of non-confidence may be preceded by a long preamble, listing the reasons why the government no longer has the support of a majority in the House. It may, like the motion adopted in

2011, hint darkly at the government's real or purported wrongdoings. Here is what the 2011 confidence motion said:

That the House agree with the finding of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs that the government is in contempt of Parliament, which is unprecedented in Canadian parliamentary history, and consequently, the House has lost confidence in the government.

That is, by the way, a fiction. The procedure and House affairs committee had not submitted its report. I know this because I was in the midst of addressing that draft report when our proceedings were suspended by the vote of non-confidence. The bells started ringing and our meeting suspended. Nonetheless, the vote took place and there was an election.

In 2005, Paul Martin's government was brought down by a motion that simply stated, "That this House has lost confidence in the government." Today's motion, in that tradition, says simply, "That the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government."

There is a sense in which the current government has not had the confidence of the Canadian people for some time. In preparation for my remarks today, I wrote down the percentage of the vote that every victorious party has had in a Canadian election going back to 1958.

The current government was elected in 2019 with 33.12% of the vote and in 2021 with only 32.62% of the vote. More than two-thirds of Canadians voted against the current government at that time. This is really bad. In 1958, the year of John Diefenbaker's colossal victory over the Liberals, do members know that the Liberals, who were defeated in their worst defeat ever up to that point in time, had 33.75% of the vote? They got more votes as a percentage than the current government received in either of the last two elections.

What is even more amazing is that when we take into account the percentage of people who actually participated, which was 79% back in 1958 and only 62% in the last election, we learn that the Liberals in 1958, in that colossal defeat, had 26.6% of all eligible voters, whereas only 20.3% of eligible voters voted for the current government. There is a real sense in which the government has not had the support of the Canadian people for some time, and we can see why, based on its phenomenal record of incompetence.

I just want to assert that the time has come to accept the judgment of the Canadian people, to let them have the chance to make the same judgment again and to elect a new government that can bring them the competent and honourable governance they deserve.

• (1615)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is interesting listening to the member across the way. My recollection of history is that only one government, that I am aware of, avoided accountability to the House of Commons, and through the House of Commons, to the people of Canada. That was actually Stephen Harper's government.

The member did not make reference to it, but Stephen Harper determined that he would prorogue the House to prevent a vote of non-confidence. At no point in time, contrary to the false impression that the member put on the record, has the current government ever avoided accountability, even during the pandemic.

The members will find that the current Prime Minister has answered more questions in the House, at virtually double the number, than Stephen Harper ever did. It is a bit much to try to say that this Prime Minister is not accountable; in fact, quite the opposite is the case, especially compared with Stephen Harper, the prime minister the member served under.

Can the member provide his thoughts about what took place when former prime minister Stephen Harper prorogued the session in order to avoid a confidence vote?

Mr. Scott Reid: Madam Speaker, first, I will deal with the assertion that the Prime Minister has never tried to avoid facing the House on this issue. On March 24, 2020, hoping that we would be in a panic, the government tried to get unanimous consent to push through a provision. This would have given it the power to avoid facing a confidence vote in the House for a little over year and a half.

When the opposition showed some backbone, the government was forced to move to a normal process and to have some give-and-take. The Conservatives spent all day going back and forth, working on adjustments, and the provision was removed from the legislation. To be clear, it was done because the government and the Prime Minister could not get away with it.

With regard to the issue of Stephen Harper proroguing to avoid a confidence vote, the member is almost right. In 2008, shortly after the election, there was a move to bring down the government. The House was prorogued, and it came back; the opposition could then have brought down the government, had it so chosen. What it did instead was to propose an arrangement under which the government would spend a certain amount of money on infrastructure in order to deal with the 2008 economic crisis, and there would be periodic reviews of that.

At any of those review points, the government could have been brought down on a confidence motion. Indeed, that was built into the structure of the deal. All the parties participated, and if the member has a problem with that, he should go back and consult with the members of his party who were present.

• (1620)

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, today, we are examining a motion that asks us whether we have confidence in the government.

My colleague talked a lot about history, but I would like to remind him of two or three facts.

We could look back at the Second World War, when a federal government got elected by promising that it would never impose conscription, but conscription did happen. We could look back at 1970, when 500 Quebecers were imprisoned for no reason, without rights, because of a Liberal government order. We could look

Business of Supply

back at the night of the long knives in 1982, when an agreement was signed with all of the premiers behind Quebec's back. We could look back at Meech Lake, when an attempt was made to reintegrate Quebec into the Constitution. Quebec had minimal demands, but they were all dismissed out of hand.

Today, we are being asked whether Quebecers have confidence in the Liberal government. No, we do not. We did not have confidence in it yesterday, we do not have confidence in it today, and we will not have confidence in it tomorrow, but we also do not have confidence in the Conservatives. We do not have confidence in the NDP either. We do not have confidence in anyone in the House.

The Bloc Québécois exists because Quebecers' rights have been violated for 150 years under the Constitution. This is not an issue that is going to be resolved today.

Mr. Scott Reid: Madam Speaker, I think that was more of a comment than a question.

[English]

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am thinking of the Conservatives' cuts to health care transfers and science investments. They are now looking at cuts to pharmacare and dental care.

The member likes history, so I would like to know this: Why do the Conservatives have such a history of cuts?

Mr. Scott Reid: Madam Speaker, I think the member is mistaken with the list of cuts she gave. My party, under our current leadership and under, hopefully, some of our other leaders in the past, has demonstrated a concern for making sure we do not spend money we do not have. We do not promise to spend on programs we cannot actually finance.

We also do not engage in wishful thinking, as the Liberals do, which will create unsustainable programs. We will try to make sure that every program we commit to, every kind of social spending, is properly funded so that it can be carried on sustainably into the future.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Richmond Hill, my fellow York Region colleague.

I am speaking today on an important topic that the opposition has brought forward, and I will start by saying that Canadians have been through a lot over the last several years. To put that in context, Canadians have gone through a global pandemic. This was a once-in-a-lifetime event, a once-in-100-years event; obviously, it took a toll on Canadians. A massive component of our economy was frozen; kids needed to stay home from school, and businesses were shut. However, our government was there to support Canadians, Canadian workers and Canadian businesses. Yes, we invested in them during this time. We did this to ensure that, when the pandemic finished, the Canadian economy would exit the downturn it caused and people would get back to work. This is exactly what happened.

Business of Supply

Of course, after the pandemic, we had the war in Ukraine. It was the first time in 80 years that war was brought back to Europe. There were supply chain snarls and, with them, global inflation. We saw inflation take effect across the world because of supply chain bottlenecks; the demand that was created during the pandemic, when everyone was stuck at home, and subsequent to it; and, of course, geopolitics.

In the Canadian economy, we are now at a point where, inflation has returned to 2%, the bank's target range. Interest rates are coming down, and we saw the Bank of Canada cut 75 basis points today. The governor indicated that further potential cuts will come down the road. My personal opinion, as an economist, is that the Bank of Canada will continue cutting rates through this next series of meetings. If I had to provide a forecast, it would probably be between an additional 150 to 225 basis points, but probably near the 200 basis-point range.

Where does this leave Canadians? We know that Canadians have endured a lot with global inflation, COVID, wars going on and uncertainty in the world. However, we have had the backs of Canadians, and we will continue to do so. Why is that? It is because we have put in place transformational pillars to strengthen our social safety net; create the conditions for economic growth, wealth creation and job creation; and move the country forward.

When I think about the Canada child benefit, which we put in place in 2015, it now sends nearly \$30 billion in tax-free monthly payments to families across the country. This includes over \$100 million in my riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge. It is helping tens of thousands of kids in my riding, lifting almost 400,000 kids out of poverty, and we are no longer sending checks to millionaires. These are substantive measures.

I think of the national early learning and day care plan; in the province of Ontario, fees have been reduced by 52.7%. Working in collaboration with the Progressive Conservative government in Ontario, we will see \$10-a-day day care, on average, by September 2025. We know it is working because my daughter is in day care, and we have seen a reduction. Our family, who is blessed with much, has seen over \$10,000 in after-tax savings. I have much gratitude for our blessings. Those are real savings for families.

We have also introduced the Canadian dental care plan, and 750,000 Canadians who could not afford to access a dentist have now gone to one.

These are measures that help Canadians. However, we must now create the economic conditions to ensure that we can afford these generous programs, such as increasing old age security by 10% to over three million Canadian seniors aged 75-plus. This made a real difference in the pockets of Canadian seniors.

We know the opposite party has a notion of what Canada is, but I have my own notion, and so I will disagree with them. Despite some of the headwinds we have faced, I like to refer to this decade as Canada's decade. I believe that Canada is the best country in the world. It is not because we are perfect. We are a work-in-progress. However, I know that there are millions of people who would move here tomorrow morning, and I would rather not live anywhere else.

I like to vacation in other places, where it may be sunny, but this is the best country.

• (1625)

When we think about what we have put in place as a government, working with unions and industry, we can say that this is Canada's decade. Yes, interest rates are descending. Consumer confidence in Canada has hit a 29-month high, according to Bloomberg-Nanos. I think about our strategic investments in artificial intelligence, in electric vehicles, in critical minerals and in the supply chain for electric vehicles. BloombergNEF has rated us the number one country in the world. Depending on the year, it can be number two versus China, but we are number one. I think of our investments in Canadians and in learning.

We put all those measures in place, working with the provinces on our electricity system for a competitive advantage, in the sense that almost 90% of Canada's electricity system is green. We are working with companies in Alberta, such as Dow Chemical, with a \$10-billion investment, or Linde, with a \$2-billion investment. We are supporting Atlantic Canadians, ensuring that electricity rates remain low to be competitive and attract industry. This is truly Canada's decade.

Looking around the world, we can say that we have what the world wants. We have the energy, the natural resources and the human capital. I am looking at the sectors around the world and what we have, whether it is Alberta and the advantage on feedstock, British Columbia and the human capital that is powering that province forward in its film industry or here in Ontario and the electric vehicle sector or the fintech sector.

I am looking at the province of Quebec and the aerospace industry, which transcends industry in many parts of the country. We have what the world wants, and we are doing things in such a way that our fiscal finances and our budget are the envy of the world. We have a 1% deficit-to-GDP ratio. The United States and the European countries have a 7% deficit-to-GDP ratio.

We have a AAA credit rating. It matters. Our borrowing rates are actually lower than those of most of the G7 countries, if not the lowest. Yes, we have challenges. We absolutely have issues. Canadians know that. That is what governing is about: taking on tough challenges. We will continue to do that, but this is fundamentally Canada's decade. I truly believe that. As we go forward, we are projected to lead economic growth in 2025 in the G7. Our finances are probably the best, if not the best, in the G20.

Business of Supply

I think of the programs we put in place: The Canada child benefit is helping millions of kids and families and lifting kids out of poverty; through the national early learning and day care plan, we have seen a 53% price reduction. We are the funding partner, and then the Progressive Conservative government in Ontario actually operates the program in my region and through York Region. I speak to day care operators in the province of Ontario, and they say the demand for day care spots has gone up. Therefore, we have responsibly said that we will provide those loans, incentives and grants for day care operators to expand spaces.

In terms of the dental care plan, over 8,000 residents in my riding have now been approved for dental care. I do not think any government wants to take away dental care from seniors and vulnerable Canadians. Does anyone? I do not think any government will take away the national day care and early learning program from any other government. Quebec has had it for many years. Would any party in this room, in the House, go to the Province of Quebec and say that they have to remove their early learning and day care plan? I do not think so, or I would love to hear from the opposite aisle.

This is Canada's decade on the economy, on our social programs and on making this truly what we call inclusive economic growth. We will absolutely see those flowers bloom. Inflation is at 2%. Rates are coming down. Consumer confidence is increasing. It is going to take time, but we are there.

• (1630)

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the summer, I was fortunate enough to be able to door knock in Vaughan—Woodbridge, the member opposite's riding. Certainly, the constituents there do not have confidence in the Prime Minister.

For over a year, the member has been contacting folks on this side of the House via text and phone, asking if there is a spot for him in the Conservative Party of Canada. Today he says he has confidence in his government, yet he wants a spot over here. Why would we believe anything he has to say?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I will not entertain the member's question.

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to turn the tables a bit and ask my colleague this question, because, to me, it is far from obvious. Why should we still have confidence in the Liberal government and its Prime Minister?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his very important question. As I said in my speech, Canada is in a good position for this decade.

[English]

I am calling this Canada's decade because I fundamentally believe, speaking to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, that we are positioned very favourably within the contexts of what is going on geopolitically, the world economy, our investments in AI, our electric vehicles, the agriculture sector and the aerospace industry, which I know is a leader in Quebec, as well as the aluminum sector, including the decarbonization of the aluminum sector in the

province of Quebec, and the decarbonization of the steel industry here in Canada as well.

In Ontario, we are positioned uniquely. We will be a leader in the economy, and we will generate what is called—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to provide time for more questions.

Continuing with questions and comments, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford has the floor.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I think that some of the Liberals' current troubles are due to the fact that they are lacking in big, bold ideas right now. I will give one example. Canadians are really suffering, but at the same time, certain corporate sectors have never had it better. I will highlight the oil and gas industry in particular because, over the period from 2019 to 2022, its net profits went up by over 1,000%.

We can see where Canadians' paycheques are going. They are going straight to the coffers of big corporations. The Liberals have subsidized those oil and gas companies with a new pipeline and direct subsidies to them. They pay a fraction of the carbon tax.

Through you, Madam Speaker, to my colleague, where are the big, bold ideas from the Liberals at this time of crisis? This is tailor-made for big, bold, progressive ideas, and the Liberals have been lacking on that front.

• (1635)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, the member from the New Democratic Party comes from my home province of British Columbia. We have seen greenhouse gas emissions. To lower them is the goal. We are seeing them coming down. Our plan is working. This is a transition. We know this is a transition in moving to renewable energy from non-renewable energy. The transition will take a period of time. We know we will continue to use non-renewable energy sources for a certain period of time, of course, for years to come.

We also know that markets around the world need secure energy suppliers such as Canada. We are blessed with it. We will utilize that. We will utilize this industry. We cannot forget about the 800,000 to 900,000 Canadian workers who directly work for the energy industry. We will need to support them. We will continue to have their backs.

The renewable industry is growing in Canada. It is growing around the world. We can tell from IEA reports how much is coming on stream. It is great to see that Canada, again, is a leader in position for this decade.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, the member did not answer the question that the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford asked. What he asked was specifically about the tens of billions of dollars that the oil and gas industry has made by gouging Canadians at the pumps.

I asked about this last night. I will ask about it again now because the governing party should have better answers on addressing the affordability crisis and addressing the climate at the same time. They can do that by putting a windfall profit tax on these excess profits and use that money to make life more affordable for regular folks, for example, by investing in public transit.

Could the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge speak to what can be done so that we can work together toward a reasonable solution to address affordability, such as a windfall profit tax on oil and gas?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, the hon. member mentioned public transit. We have put in place a \$3-billion annual public transit fund for projects across the country to get people moving faster to work and faster to home. It is a great investment we are making. I am glad that we are doing that.

Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge framed his remarks by saying that, indeed, this is Canada's decade. For the past hours, my colleagues have talked about many aspects of why it has been Canada's decade on the economic front, the environmental front or the social front. However, there is another dimension as to why this is Canada's decade, and it was not like that a decade before.

It is truly an honour to rise in the House today to speak about our government's accomplishments and the important work that we are doing and continue to do each and every day. Let me take a moment to reflect on the aspect I was referring to, which is the progress made on the path to reconciliation. The work that our government has done on that should also be recognized as to why it is Canada's decade.

Let us remember where we were in 2015. After a decade of Harper and the Conservatives in power, the state of the relationship between Canada and indigenous people was extremely tense. We will remember Idle No More, when indigenous people and Canadians joined together to protest across the country because Stephen Harper refused to listen to them. The courts had already ruled that the Conservatives had continued the systematic underfunding of first nations communities when it came to critical infrastructure such as water treatment plants. Is it any surprise that there were 105 long-term drinking water advisories in place by the end of their mandate a decade ago?

We might say this is in the past, that the old Conservative Party was different, but let us remember that the Leader of the Opposition was not only a member of that government but also the minister responsible for housing in that government, and his record speaks for itself. The number was six. As well, from 2011 to 2015, the Harper government did not make a single new investment in first nations housing, and the Conservative leader's \$300-million boondoggle first nations housing program only managed to build 99 homes on reserves.

Let us remember the colonial and oppressive policies of the Conservative government that devastated communities by separating children from their families and culture for generations. Let us remember the disproportionate violence that the indigenous women and girls experienced, and continue to experience to this day. In 2015, the Prime Minister promised to transform this relationship. The Prime Minister said that no relationship is more important than a relationship with indigenous people. We have seen the proof of that over the last 10 years, and we have been working very hard ever since to honour our commitment to the path of reconciliation.

Allow me to cover some of the aspects that we have been focusing on. I will start with expanding our housing initiative. We are the first government to work side by side with indigenous partners to assess the scope and scale of housing and infrastructure needs on reserves. Co-developing a 10-year housing and infrastructure strategy is our government's priority. Following the lead of the partners, we have supported the construction, renovation and retrofit of more than 36,000 homes in first nations communities, as well as 9,000 infrastructure projects, to ensure families are housed safely. We are creating tangible, lasting, indigenous-led solutions to close the gap and build strong, healthy communities.

What is also crucial in building strong, healthy communities is long-term access to clean water. I said earlier that, in 2015, we started with 105 advisories. Water is life, and everyone needs equitable access to clean water free from pollution. Since 2015, we have supported first nations drinking water infrastructure and operation. As a result, first nations received on average over three times more annual funding for water and waste-water systems compared to the previous Conservative government. If members want numbers, it is \$492 million versus \$162 million.

● (1640)

Now, 95% of communities do not have a long-term advisories. We have helped lift 145 long-term drinking water advisories and prevented over 275 short-term advisories from becoming long term. There is also a plan and project team in place working toward a lift in 30 communities with remaining long-term drinking water advisories.

After years of collaboration with first nations partners, we have introduced the first nations clean water act to hold government accountable for investing what is needed in water infrastructure, creating the tools first nations need to manage their own water systems and protecting the lakes and rivers they draw their water from to ensure first nations have clean drinking water for generations to come. Now we are listening to all perspectives from first nations partners at the committee on how to improve the bill. I hope all parties will support this important legislation and ensure it goes through the parliamentary process without any delay.

Business of Supply

Another aspect that I would like to highlight is our advancement in child and family services. We vowed to do the hard but important work to address the harmful impacts of child and welfare systems on first nations, Inuit and Métis communities. Bill C-92 became law on January 1, 2020, and it clearly affirms that indigenous people have the right to decide what is best for their children, families and communities. We continue to work with several communities and provincial governments to restore these inherent rights and ensure continued long-term funding for child and family services.

Just two weeks ago, the Minister of Indigenous Services joined the GNN to sign a coordination agreement that affirms its jurisdiction over child and family services. This is the 10th community to reign control over their own child and family services, with more on the way. This is a pivotal moment for reconciliation. We are closer than ever to shifting the power back to indigenous people for better child and family services. For GNN, and eventually more communities, it means that the children will grow up and stay close to their families with the services they need, surrounded by the love and care they need.

If I had more time, I would have talked about the education work that we are doing. Nearly 25,000 students, in five provinces, are in culturally appropriate education programs right now, through 10 agreements that have been made.

I would have talked about the economic reconciliation path that we are on, the work that our Minister of Indigenous Services has done and the forum that was hosted in February. However, I am almost out of time, so I will conclude.

Canadians should be proud of the progress made on the path to reconciliation, but we know there is still a lot more work to do. A flame has been ignited, but it is fragile and needs nurturing. Without care, it could be extinguished by reckless cuts and indifference. We cannot forget that Conservatives voted against funding for indigenous priorities during the marathon votes. They have told us exactly where they stand, and it is certainly not with indigenous people. Most Canadians have already left these colonial attitudes in the past. Today, our government is focused on building a system where everyone has a fair chance to succeed.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, we said in several occasions that we have no more confidence in the Liberals than in the Conservatives, and for good reason.

Let me first mention a few contradictions. The government calls itself the champion of the free choice of pregnant women when it comes to making decisions about their own bodies, specifically under section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, on the security of the person, and paragraph 2(a) of the Charter, on women's freedom of conscience and freedom of choice when it comes to a decision as personal as whether to terminate a pregnancy or not.

Then again, the self-proclaimed champion of freedom of choice just cannot bring itself to be the champion of freedom of choice when it comes to such a personal issue as the end of life. The gov-

ernment refuses to move forward with advance requests for people who are suffering and who will develop dementia.

That is why we cannot have confidence in a government that is out of touch with the 83% of Canadians and 87% of Quebecers who support this measure. How does the member justify depriving people who are suffering of the ability to decide what to do with their own bodies once they have reached the point where they can take no more?

[*English*]

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Madam Speaker, my colleague's talking about freedom of choice gives me a great opportunity to actually highlight our pharmacare bill. Part of that is free contraceptives, which will give women choice in their life.

Going back to the point of advance requests, if it were that easy and were not complicated, it would have been done. The hon. member mentioned that 91% of Canada is in support of that. Maybe 91% of Quebec is in support of that, but that is not 91% of Canada.

We are working very hard, both in the House and in the Senate, with key members to ensure that every aspect and every unintended consequence of the bill, including advance requests, is taken into account.

• (1650)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that the Conservatives have treated indigenous people in this country with such immense malice, whether it was from the water legislation that ultimately was defeated in court because it failed to deliver clean water or whether it was child and family services that Conservatives continued to pump money into while families continued to get broken. There is no question that in their time, the Conservatives were brutal to indigenous people.

However, the Liberal member mentioned that the Liberals have served indigenous people to the maximum extent to which they possibly could. I want to correct the record on that because time and time again, several promises that the Liberal government made have been broken, whether it is on trying to reform child and family services by way of Bill C-92, which many nations, still today, cannot access because of the lack of funding; whether it is on the murdered and missing indigenous women and girls inquiry, where it would take generations to actually implement all the calls to action at the pace the government is going; whether it is the failure to ensure that clean water in indigenous communities is actually delivered by way of a comprehensive clean water strategy; or lastly, whether it is on housing.

Business of Supply

As the New Democratic Party's critic for indigenous housing, I can say that less than 1% of all allocated funding for indigenous housing has gone out the door. That is shameful in a housing crisis. In my community of Edmonton Griesbach, for example, there are 4,011 people who are unhoused or without stable housing as of July. This is a crisis manifesting in indigenous communities that is then being transitioned to poverty in our streets.

How can the member explain the massive difference between his party and the Conservatives, who continue to treat—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Richmond Hill.

Mr. Majid Jowhari: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his passion and his advocacy for the indigenous community.

I will reiterate what I said in my closing remarks: A flame has been ignited but it is fragile and needs nurturing.

I would like to respond by asking, do we have a lot more work to do? Absolutely. Do we have a lot more consultation to do? Absolutely. Do we need to work with our partners, different indigenous communities and organizations, as well as provinces, to ensure that we give the supports that are needed? Yes. Do we need to make sure that we also build the capacity so we can hand over the various economic aspects to indigenous communities? Yes.

We have a lot of work to do, and we are committed to doing it. We ask for the member's support in doing that.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): 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 Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, Public Services and Procurement; the hon. member for Calgary Centre, Finance; the hon. member for Portage—Lisgar, The Economy.

[*English*]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am going to split my time with my friend and colleague from Fundy Royal.

We live in the best country in the world, and I do not even recognize it anymore. That is why we are here today. We talk about a country that is deeply broken at this juncture in the House as we speak about confidence in the Prime Minister, because of what is happening outside the House and because of what is happening in every city right across the country. Housing prices have doubled. The price of rent has doubled. The price of a mortgage payment has doubled after nine years, with photo-ops from the Prime Minister and his housing plan.

We talk about drugs, chaos and disorder in our streets to levels I have never seen before. That is why I say I do not recognize this country anymore. I do not recognize the city I grew up in. There are tent encampments, 1,800 in Ontario alone, that have popped up in places they had never been before. People are not just down on their luck; there were always tent encampments, but there are middle-class Canadians who now cannot afford a place to live.

This is not the country I grew up in. This is not the country my parents chose to make home. There was a deal in this country, and when my parents came to this country, when they chose to make Canada home, my father was an uncredentialed engineer. He ended up driving a taxi to put his wife through school and to make sure he could buy a home in a safe neighbourhood for his family. That is exactly what he did. He sent two kids to school and made sure that in one generation, we could go from the front seat of a taxi to the front row of Parliament Hill. That is the dream of this country. Today, people cannot do that.

When I say I do not recognize this country, I do not recognize it because nine out of 10 young Canadians do not believe they will ever own a home. The drugs, the chaos and the disorder in our streets are being pumped up by the Prime Minister, who is allowing people to languish right in front of us. He is not providing people with care and support but is drowning them in excessive taxes, making their lives unaffordable. He is feeding their own affliction of addiction with taxpayer-funded drugs, creating a street-level palliative care that nobody in this country ever dreamed of seeing in the streets.

It is not just in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver. I have seen that for many years; I saw that 20 years ago. It is now in every single city, everywhere in the country. The Prime Minister has spent more than every other prime minister combined. The Prime Minister continues to hang his hat on quadrupling the carbon tax to go to 61¢ a litre. Not only that, but it is going to cost our economy \$30 billion in lost GDP.

The situation is dire in this country. Canada has the lowest per capita GDP, not just now but also for the next 30 years. I know it is a fact that the Liberals do not admit, but they printed it in their own budget. We are squandering opportunity in this country. We have everything we need below our feet. We have the smart, industrious Canadian people who can build pipelines, who can work in mines and who can deliver the critical minerals we need for a government that says everybody is going to drive a Tesla by 2035.

We have everything, and we squander that opportunity. We have the smartest people in the world. We have enough food to feed ourselves for a generation. We have enough of what we need below our feet, like natural gas, liquefied natural gas, lithium and cobalt, to displace the dictator oil that is being sold to those on the other side of the world whose wars are killing our very own people.

• (1655)

We are an embarrassment on the world stage. We no longer sit at the table. We no longer even sit at the kids' table. They just do not even call us anymore.

Business of Supply

The Prime Minister has lost moral clarity on issues that I thought were really clear in this country, with long-standing Canadian policy thrown out the window. It is sad to watch what has happened in this country, and that is exactly why we have put forward the motion today, a motion that is now supported by the NDP leader, who last Monday came out with a video, a huge production, saying that he was ripping up the agreement, that he and the Liberals were not friends anymore and that they were having a breakup.

It was a very public breakup until Thursday, when they got back together. They taped up the agreement. There was a little bit of weirdness when the NDP leader said, after voting 24 times to increase the carbon tax, that he was no longer for the carbon tax. I am not sure where that is today.

The NDP leader is constantly trying to pretend to hold the government to account. He says the agreement was ripped up, but then he put the agreement back together and is going to vote to keep the Prime Minister in power. He is going to vote against the workers he once pretended to represent in this place. He is going to work against the constituents in his riding and all the ridings of his members who want to see the Prime Minister go.

I am not the only one who hears it. I was out everywhere this summer, and the refrain is very similar. The refrain is even similar in Quebec. It is time for the Prime Minister to take a walk in the snow, take a walk in the sand, go surfing or play piano in the middle of a bar while drunk before another eminent funeral. That is, frankly, what the Prime Minister is doing right now, as he is not in this place but in New York City—

• (1700)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows very well that we are not to mention the presence or absence of members.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister is at the UN General Assembly representing the country. He is probably checking out the \$9-billion condo.

There is so much that the government owes to Canadians, so many explanations, such as why it spent \$67 million on a program to collect guns from people and has not collected a gun; why it cannot stop car thefts by putting scanners in at the ports; why it turns repeat violent offenders out onto the streets moments, minutes or hours after they commit crimes; why the Prime Minister hired an anti-Semite to provide anti-racism training to the Government of Canada; or why he appointed a human rights commissioner he had to fire before he even started because he too was an anti-Semite.

These are just a few examples. I have only 10 minutes, but we could go through a litany of the government's failure to the Canadian people.

This is a country that I think every member of the House, every member on this side of the House, has faith in fixing. With the member for Carleton as the next prime minister, we are going to axe the carbon tax on every single family everywhere in this country, and for good. There would be no more 61¢ a litre and no more loss of \$30 billion to our economy. We are going to bring in a middle-class tax cut for workers in this country to make sure they can

take more of their paycheque home and make decisions on their own.

We are going to bring in a dollar-for-dollar law, where for every dollar spent in the government, we are going to find a dollar of savings. We are going to cut the massive amount of waste and corruption from that side of the House. We are going to stop the crime by stopping the repeat violent offenders from getting out on bail the second they get into jail, and make sure they cannot serve their sentences in mom's basement while they think about what they have done, only to do it again.

I believe that if other members of the House had any courage, they would understand what Canadians are saying. They would understand that Canadians want a carbon tax election. I would ask that members of the House finally put it to Canadians and give them the carbon tax election they want.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it would appear that, based on announcements that were made even last week, today's debate is not about confidence in the government. It is about confidence in the official opposition.

What do our colleagues in the Bloc and the NDP know and why does the member opposite think that they are not going to support the initiative that the Conservatives have put forward?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, what are we talking about? This is about confidence in the Prime Minister. We are arguing that the House has lost confidence in the Prime Minister. I know that I have lost confidence in the Prime Minister. I have just laid out why. I just do not understand why the member does not agree.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, like Gollum and his “precious”, the leader of the Conservative Party is so obsessed with the throne that even though he gets 125 questions a week, I have never heard him ask a single question about protecting supply management. I have never heard him ask a single question about advance requests for medical assistance in dying. He opposes that. I have never heard him ask a single question about increasing the purchasing power of seniors.

Then he wonders why Quebeckers do not want a Conservative government, any more than they want a Liberal government, and why they vote for the Bloc Québécois.

• (1705)

[English]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, it sounds like that member has a problem with the Liberal government and yet his leader is going to force the entire party to vote to keep the Prime Minister in power, to keep the highest-spending Prime Minister in power against the wishes of Quebeckers, against the wishes of the Quebec premier and certainly against the wishes of his own constituents.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Thornhill spoke about encampments. There are encampments right in downtown Kitchener. The number of folks living unsheltered has tripled in recent years and so I share with her that concern, but let us not pretend that this only started in the last nine years. It has been three decades of Liberal and Conservative governments that have taken turns underinvesting in affordable housing and all, of a sudden, a crisis emerges as a result.

Provincial and federal governments have put more and more incentives in place for large corporate investors like real estate investment trusts to buy up housing in my community, raise the rents and renovict folks.

If the member for Thornhill is looking for support to not have confidence in the government, what can she share about truly addressing the affordability crisis when it comes to housing, which involves investing in housing the way we used to decades ago and addressing the financialization of housing in this country?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, the member opposite should just take a look outside. There are 258 tent encampments in Toronto alone, 50 that are new this summer, and that is a direct result of the punishing costs of the carbon tax and a housing plan that has doubled the cost of housing right across the country. We have been very clear that we are going to force municipalities to approve more housing and, if they do not, we will penalize them. We are going to reduce carbon taxes so that the costs of the building materials can be lower. Those are the real solutions. Instead of supporting this government blindly, he should open his eyes and look at all the tent encampments in his own riding.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I took note of the member's comments when she was talking about the toxic drug crisis. When the Standing Committee on Health visited the epicentre in the Downtown Eastside for two days, not one single Conservative MP bothered to show up to speak to frontline personnel, medical professionals and people with lived experience. If they had showed up, they would have heard a narrative that completely blows up what they are trying to pursue here in the House of Commons.

Conservatives go on and on about tackling harm reduction and safe supply. Is compassionate conservatism now about letting people play Russian roulette on the streets with toxic-laced drugs?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I thank God that member was not in charge of drug policy when I myself had to get help. I thank God my family was around me with support. I thank God that there was no safe supply because, like so many others, the 47,000 people in this country who have died because of these failed drug policies, I would be dead too.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Madam Speaker, the motion that we are debating today is pretty simple, but the effect it is having in Canadians from coast to coast is profound. The motion says that the House has no confidence in the Prime Minister and the government. That is not just what we are saying here as a Conservative caucus, but that is what I am hearing in my riding of Fundy Royal, where people now are hurting in ways that they were not hurting before this Prime Minister came along.

Under this Liberal government over the last nine years, we have seen some absolutely astronomical increases in the misery that Canadians are facing, and I want to just speak to a few of those. These are the facts, and Canadians are aware of these facts. In spite of what the Prime Minister will say to try to change the channel, Canadians are smart and attuned to what is happening around them. They know that this government's policies are hurting them and hurting their ability to put food on their table, to pay their mortgage, to pay their rent, to keep their houses heated and to put gas in their vehicles. Everyday Canadians are aware of the impact of this government's reckless actions.

Under this government, in nine years only, they have doubled the debt of this country. They have doubled housing costs: mortgage payments and rent payments are doubled. They have caused the worst inflation in 40 years. They have sent two million people to the food bank. Food bank usage has risen every year for the last nine years, and that is every year that this government has been in power. Every year, they have added to the misery facing Canadians.

We used to look at parts of Vancouver and see the tent cities that had risen up there, and we used to see that as something that was unique to that area, but now, whether I am in Saint John, New Brunswick; Moncton; Fredericton; Halifax; or anywhere from coast to coast, we are seeing tent cities. We are seeing an increase in the misery that Canadians are facing.

Canadians have been forced to pay more for gas, groceries and home heating thanks to this completely out-of-touch Liberal carbon tax. At a time when people are struggling and having to make choices between heating their home, putting food on the table or filling their cars so they can get to work, and heaven forbid if their kids are playing hockey or are into other sports and they have to transport them in their vehicle, Canadians are stretched to the limit. What does this government do? What does this Prime Minister do? They say that, no, Canadians are not paying enough. Even though the carbon tax is hitting people at 20¢ a litre, that has to go up. That has to go up eventually to 61¢ per litre.

In April alone, the Prime Minister increased the carbon tax by 23% as part of his plan to quadruple the tax to 61¢ per litre by 2030. According to the Fraser Institute, this will end up costing the average Canadian worker \$6,700 per year and result in 164,000 fewer jobs.

As for the constituents I am talking to, their views on this Prime Minister are being reflected across the country in the by-election results that we have seen. In three by-elections in a row, he has lost, but the conclusion the Prime Minister comes to is that it is not that he is wrong; it is that Canadians are wrong. That is always his default, because he believes that he knows best, he is always right and that everything that we are facing is somebody else's fault.

After nine years, the blame for the situation that we are facing now as Canadians has to be laid squarely at the feet of this Liberal government and this Liberal Prime Minister. This is not some accident. The Prime Minister will often say that there are global trends and so on. The misery that we are seeing, for example the increase in crime, has to be directly blamed on the deliberate actions of this government.

● (1710)

Bill C-75, which was introduced and passed by the current government, created a revolving door so that the default is for an offender to get bail. Bail means that the person is back out on the street after committing a serious offence. We are hearing from experts, police officers and community leaders that the revolving door of repeat and, oftentimes, violent offenders is leading to tragic results. It is not that there are lots of Canadians involved in crime. It is that a small number of Canadians should be in jail, and they are committing a lot of crime.

Let us look at what Statistics Canada says about just how out of control violent crime has become since 2015, the year the Liberals took power. I think members will agree that the numbers are absolutely staggering and are an indictment on the entire approach, the entire soft-on-crime, revolving-door, catch-and-release system that the Liberals have created. Madam Speaker, notice that I do not call it a “justice” system. It is only a system because there is no justice for victims in it. I was very moved at the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights when we had a witness, who was a victim of crime, say that she does not call it a justice system, because she did not see the justice for her and her family in the system.

The crime statistics from Statistics Canada are as follows: Auto theft is up by 46%. Violent crime is up by 50%. Sexual assaults are up by 75%. Homicides are up by 28%. Human trafficking is up by 83%. Crimes against children are up by over 100%, at 118%. Gang-related murders have doubled. Extortion is up by 357%.

The Prime Minister talks a good game about gun crimes, but all we have seen now is \$67 million spent on a gun confiscation scheme that has not collected one firearm. For all his talk about firearms crime, what is the result? Violent gun crime has gone up by 116%. In fact, gun crime has gone up every year since the Prime Minister took office. These are deliberate actions.

Bill C-5, another terrible bill by the government, eliminated mandatory penalties related to gun crimes, such as robbery with a firearm, extortion with a firearm, weapons trafficking, possession of a firearm obtained illegally and using a firearm in the commission of an offence. What else did Bill C-5 do? It eliminated mandatory prison time for drug dealers, as well as for those who were convicted of trafficking or possession for the purpose of trafficking, importing and exporting serious drugs and production of a schedule I substance, such as heroin, cocaine, fentanyl or crystal meth. All of these offences are now eligible for house arrest.

The bill also allows for house arrest for sexual assault, kidnapping, human trafficking, motor vehicle theft, abduction of a person under 14, and assault causing bodily harm or with a weapon. Before the current government came along, all the offences I just listed would have meant incarceration; the offender would serve their time out of the community, in jail, where they belong. The commu-

Business of Supply

nity would be safe while the repeat offender was in jail. Instead, under the current government, these individuals are back on the street and committing the same crime over and over again.

I heard one Liberal member mention their so-called safe supply. Just today, the newspaper reported that a “police raid at a heavily used harm reduction site in Nanaimo resulted in” an individual being “charged with 14 counts of possession for the purpose of trafficking and eight weapons offences.” This was so-called legal safe supply. In the same raid, another person “was charged with six possession for the purpose of trafficking and five weapons offences”. As Conservatives have been saying, this so-called safe supply is getting into our streets and harming our young people.

It is time for the Prime Minister to face reality. It is time to call a carbon tax election so that common-sense Conservatives can axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

● (1715)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member opposite, like all Conservative members, sure has the slogans down pat. I will give him that much. They likely already have the bumper stickers printed to match the slogans.

In their thirst and hunger for power, have the Conservatives given any thought to working for Canadians today until the next election happens? Why not look at the issues Canadians are facing today and start being a little more proactive in allowing legislation, for example, to advance to the committee stage, even legislation they support?

The Conservatives are so focused on the Conservative Party and their leader that they have lost their focus on Canadians. The question is, why?

Business of Supply

• (1720)

Hon. Rob Moore: Madam Speaker, the hon. member cannot be real. Conservative members of Parliament come here every day to fight for a better Canada and their constituents. What our constituents are telling us is they cannot afford more years of the government. They cannot afford skyrocketing crime. They cannot afford groceries, heat, their mortgage, their rent or to put food on the table. We have the worst inflation in 40 years. Two million people are attending food banks.

Canadians cannot afford another second of the Liberal government.

[Translation]

Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and for reminding us how difficult the situation is for many people in Quebec and Canada.

I would like to ask for my colleague's opinion.

If the Conservatives were to form the next government, which they are desperately hoping for, would they be willing to re-evaluate the health transfers to provinces, specifically to Quebec? We know that Quebec has an \$11-billion deficit, a sizable part of which is probably due to the federal government's failure to pay the expected \$6 billion in health transfers.

I want to know whether a Conservative government would be more inclined to live up to its federal responsibility to make adequate health transfers to provinces.

[English]

Hon. Rob Moore: Madam Speaker, a new Conservative government is going to focus on improving the livelihoods and lives of all Canadians. We have to end the government's misuse of taxpayers' dollars, this waste we see. When we have waste and scandal in the system, there is less money to go around for the services that we so cherish as Canadians. This is why we are going to stop the crime, fix the budget and build homes. We are going to axe the carbon tax so Canadians can afford to live again.

That is what we are talking about. That is the focus of a new government that is going to be there for Canadians.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, the corporate coalition of the Liberals and the Conservatives teamed up to make sure that contract flipping was not addressed in committee today. The week before, they teamed up to make sure that Canada's largest corporate landlords did not have to come to committee to be accountable to Canadians.

We know that the Conservatives continue, just like the Liberals, to wine and dine the corporate elites in Canada for fundraising purposes. Why do the Conservatives continue to support the Liberals in protecting their corporate landlords in committee?

Hon. Rob Moore: Madam Speaker, the hon. member is missing the point of the debate today. The Conservative Party is calling for non-confidence. The House does not have confidence in the Prime Minister or the government.

Everything about the government is wrong because it is not putting the people of Canada first. It is selfishly, with much greed, taking more than it should, taking too much from taxes, making it too difficult for Canadian families to make ends meet and punishing good things like going to work, raising a family and driving kids to sports. All of that is punished in Trudeau's Canada, and that's going to change under a Conservative government.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I will remind the hon. member that we do not mention members' names in the House.

The hon. member for Kildonan—St. Paul will have about two and a half minutes for her debate.

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, tomorrow is the day that Canadians finally have the opportunity to go to an election. We are having a confidence vote tomorrow in the House. There is a real opportunity for Canadians to finally voice their concerns at the ballot box. Many Canadians have been waiting years for this opportunity, and we are at a critical time in Canadian history.

Many members on this side of the House have talked about the promise of Canada, and I too would like to talk about the promise of Canada that I was raised with.

I was raised with stories about my ancestors, the prairie pioneers who came here well over 120 years ago with barely five dollars in their pockets. They worked extremely hard and were able to buy small plots of land. They worked their butts off. They lost many of their children along the way, whether it was from the flu or farming accidents, but they had the opportunity and dream that if they worked hard and made sacrifices, the next generation would be better off. That has been true for every single generation over the last 120 years that my family has been here, until now.

Every single generation has had the opportunity to be better off because of the hard work of their parents and grandparents. However, today, half of my generation, for example, will never be able to afford a home, and to the generation after us, good luck.

We see over two million people going to food banks every month in this country. The breadlines have returned in Canada after nine years of the Liberal government. That is what we are facing in this country as a result of the Liberals' punitive carbon tax and the massive deficits that have driven up inflation. People can no longer afford to live.

Points of Order

Do members know that food banks are seeing for the first time in Canadian history full-time working parents who cannot afford to feed their families? There are 35-year-olds, fully-educated, and working young people living in their parents basements because they cannot afford homes in the neighbourhoods they grew up in. This has never been the case in Canada, ever. However, this is what has happened after nine years of failed Liberal policies. Big government is here to help, but everything has been ruined by the Liberals.

We see time and time again that they are being supported by the NDP and the Bloc. I would urge the NDP and the Bloc to vote non-confidence tomorrow, to step up, have some courage and give Canadians the hope they deserve that change is on the horizon. That can happen tomorrow.

The Conservatives will be voting non-confidence in the Liberal government tomorrow. We are proud to do so.

• (1725)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 5:27 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

[*English*]

The question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

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.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Barrett: Madam Speaker, we would like a recorded vote of non-confidence in the government.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, September 25, at the expiry of time provided for Oral Questions.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I suspect that if you canvass the House, you will find unanimous consent to see the clock as 5:42 p.m. so we can begin private members' hour.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ALLEGED VIOLATION OF STANDING ORDER 116 AT STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Madam Speaker, yesterday in the House, the hon. member for Mississauga—Erin Mills rose on a point of order stating that she had been denied an opportunity to participate in debate at the public accounts committee. She confessed that it was unusual, because the Speaker does not normally intervene in committee matters. As

chairman, I thought I should respond to the hon. member's point of order.

I would like to first assure the House that debate had collapsed. The member in question did not notify me or the clerk of the committee of her desire to join debate. After the last speaker, I waited a few moments, looking for any other speaker, at which point I called the question. The—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am going to interrupt the hon. member. If the parliamentary secretary has something to add, he can do so under another point of order.

The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest has the floor.

Mr. John Williamson: Madam Speaker, when I called the question, the member indicated a desire to speak. I said the question had been called. I was not in a position to grant that. I explained that her only option was to challenge the chair, which she did, as is the right of any member. My ruling was upheld by the committee and we proceeded to the vote.

I am not going to comment on the hon. member's motivation for coming to the House like this, but I will just highlight to our Speaker and members that my job as chair is twofold; it is to respect the rights of all members at committee and ensure everyone has the opportunity to speak, but it is also to move business along in a manner that respects the rights of all members. I did that yesterday and certainly stand by my decision.

I hope the Speaker and the desk officers, if necessary, will speak to the committee clerk, since I indicated that this member did not catch my eye or the eye of the clerk of the House of Commons public accounts committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I thank the hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest for his contribution to this point of order that was raised yesterday.

The information he has provided will be taken under advisement, and we will be getting back to the House at some point soon with a response.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from February 26 consideration of Bill S-205, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to another Act (interim release and domestic violence recognizance orders), as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, we have just finished debate in the House on a Conservative motion of non-confidence in the government. After nine years, so many Canadians are suffering as a result of the failures and frankly, in many cases the malicious failures, of the government that have undermined our national well-being and our social cohesion, as well as had a devastating impact on our economy.

I am looking forward to voting non-confidence in the government tomorrow. Tomorrow's vote will be a clear indication of where members stand. It will show which members of the House stand with the government and allow the government to continue, and which members of the House want to replace the government and give the Canadian people a chance to decide.

Our Conservative priorities are clear. We would like to bring Canadians a carbon tax election and present our proposals for axing the tax, building the homes, fixing the budget and stopping the crime.

Now we are debating Bill S-205, a Conservative private member's bill that seeks to advance our agenda of stopping the crime. It is a Conservative bill that would combat domestic violence by creating expanded measures for electronic monitoring. When I addressed the House about the bill last time, I noted that the bill would create a mechanism whereby a judge could mandate that a perpetrator would wear an electronic monitoring device, and also that victims would be consulted in the process of judges' making decisions about the kinds of orders that apply to perpetrators.

In giving judges additional tools for facilitating the monitoring of perpetrators, the bill is simply common sense and would provide additional protection and confidence for victims. It is a bill that would facilitate accountability for criminals and a greater degree of security for victims.

Sadly, the Liberal response to Bill S-205 follows a familiar pattern. When it comes to violence in general and domestic violence in particular, we hear plenty of words of solidarity from Liberal politicians. The Liberals are eager to verbally express that they care about people who are victims of domestic violence, yet when it comes to voting on measures that would actually make a concrete difference in making people safe, they back away. In fact they put forward amendments at committee and supported amendments at committee that have weakened the bill substantially.

Here at report stage, Conservatives are proposing to reverse the acts of vandalism to the good bill before us that happened at committee. We want to restore the bill such that it would live up to what was proposed and what was passed by the Senate to protect victims

of crime. It is sad to see that, despite how members of all parties make statements opposing violence against women, when it comes to actually supporting measures that would meaningfully impact that reality, Conservatives are often standing alone. Certainly, we are trying to build coalitions in this place, without the support of the government, to advance the important legislation before us.

I am very proud to speak in support of the bill, vote in support of the proposals from my colleagues that would reverse the damage done to the bill at committee, and allow Bill S-205 to pass and do the work that it is supposed to do to effectively stop crime, combat domestic violence in this country and give women a greater sense of security that those people who commit acts of violence against them would be held accountable.

• (1735)

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to speak to my private member's bill, Bill S-205. It is a very important bill.

When researching the bill, I found out that one woman is murdered every 48 hours in Canada. In fact, last year, 205 women were murdered in Canada, and we know that about 60% of murdered women in Canada were murdered by their intimate partner. This bill looks to address that. It looks to provide additional measures to protect women.

I would just like to say off the bat that we know it is not exclusively women who are victims of intimate partner violence. Men can be as well. However, overwhelmingly, we know that it is women who are victimized and abused by their intimate partners, as well as their children. This bill aims to provide additional protections for them with more tools in the tool box to save their lives and the lives of their children.

Unfortunately, through the democratic process, we saw some unfortunate moves from the NDP, the Bloc and, notably, the Liberals at the committee stage, where they gutted a lot of very important provisions in this bill to protect women. I am going to get into that in a moment.

Before I do, and before I talk a bit more about the details of the bill, I do want to thank the original creator of this bill, Senator Boisvenu, who recently retired from the Senate. This bill originated in the Senate, and I was honoured to be asked to sponsor it in this place.

Senator Boisvenu has an extraordinary story in very tragic and victorious ways. His entire career has been dedicated to safeguarding women, fighting against domestic violence and providing more security tools for women who have been victims of intimate partner violence. It was inspired by his own daughter, who was kidnapped in a parking lot and murdered by a stranger. She would have been in her twenties at that time.

Private Members' Business

As a mother now, I cannot imagine what that would have been like for a parent. It is one of the more inspiring things I have heard of since being elected as a member of Parliament, that someone turned a horrific tragedy into the motivation to protect all women across Canada. He worked tirelessly throughout his Senate career to do that, and I thank him very sincerely for his courage and hard work on this. It is truly inspiring, as an elected official, to see that. It reminds us that we can really make a big difference in this place.

I also want to thank the incredible member for Peterborough—Kawartha. In my absence in the last year after I had a baby, she shepherded the bill through committee and fought valiantly against what the Liberals and the other parties were looking to do to water it down. She did an incredible job. In fact, she has moved amendments in the House that we will vote on in the coming days. We are trying to convince everybody to put the bill back into its original form. It was stronger and provided more protections for women and victims. It was tougher on their abusers. We are looking to do that, so I thank her very much for her initiative to put forward those amendments to return it to its original stronger form. I thank her very much for her hard work.

What this bill has been left with is still very important. It is about peace bonds in particular. For those who do not know what a peace bond is, I will briefly tell them. They are sort of like restraining orders. A lot of people are familiar with that term. However, peace bonds are criminal court orders often related to the safety of property or of an individual, whereas restraining orders are non-criminal court orders often related to custody and family court issues. They are similar, but different.

Bill S-205 would allow for a peace bond to be imposed if a victim demonstrates a reasonable fear of domestic violence. A number of conditions could be added to those peace bonds. This would allow a justice, the court process and prosecutors to ask for things such as therapy for the abuser as part of the peace bond. They could also ask that those with a peace bond cannot go to certain places or have to stay within a certain area. They may have to abstain from communication with the victim, or abstain from drug and alcohol consumption.

Most notably, it would provide the option within the peace bond to wear an electronic monitoring bracelet. These really have come a long way in recent years. We are seeing in Quebec, which was one of the first to institute some of these, that it has had great success in the protection of women who have been victims of domestic violence. The abuser wears the bracelet. It has a GPS in it, which is connected to their former intimate partner's phone. If he or she, but notably he, comes within a certain distance of the person they had victimized, an alert centre would be notified and would immediately call that abuser to tell them that it is time to back off because they are getting a little close. If the abuser does not co-operate, or if there is a reason to believe that it is too tense of a situation and that it needs to send the police right away, it would do so.

● (1740)

It provides an alert system so that people can be informed of what is going on. Women can be alerted if they are in fear of their lives or if an individual is coming close. It involves a route for po-

lice to be sent directly to where an individual is and provides a barrier of protection. It is another tool in the tool box.

This bill has been isolated to peace bonds, which is very good. I am excited to see it pass, as it will save lives. However, in its original form from the Senate, it was much more broad. Justices would have had the option to apply electronic monitoring bracelets to anyone who was getting bail, which was key. It would have been a monumental milestone to have that in the Criminal Code, particularly for those who have been victims of domestic violence and intimate partner violence. Notably, intimidation, breaking and entering, and being unlawfully in a dwelling or house, those kinds of things, could have triggered a justice to make someone on bail wear an electronic monitoring bracelet. It would have given them another checklist option, whereas now it is not front and centre for justices in those scenarios.

We know about this from Senator Boisvenu and the research he has done. In particular for intimidation, breaking and entering, and being unlawfully in a house, when physical contact of an assault has not occurred but a relationship has become a tense situation, a woman could decide to seek legal help to get a peace bond or make a request through the court process for an electric monitoring bracelet. That opportunity could tip off justices that there are precursors to domestic violence, and they could institute a monitor on an individual. That was the key part missed at committee.

We recently passed something called Keira's law, which we all supported. It was a very important law. For those who are not familiar with what happened to Keira, it is a devastating story, and it is wonderful that this place came together and passed something important. It was a good bill. Some argued that the bills were similar and did the same thing, but that is not entirely accurate. In fact, Keira's law was much more narrow. Although it was still very good, the original bill was going to have much broader impacts that considered all of the different violations of our law that occur in the scope of domestic violence, leading up to it in particular.

It is quite disappointing that something that would have provided a broader scope was so limited at the committee stage. This was the status of women committee, so it was surprising and bizarre to see it being gutted piece by piece by members of the committee. I read through all the testimony, and I am still scratching my head over why they would weaken protections for victims of intimate partner violence and their children. Perhaps they will respond to clarify, because nothing has been clear in everything that I have seen communicated from them. It has been very disappointing.

Private Members' Business

They gutted another provision as well. This one was really wild. There was a provision in the bill, right at the beginning, of paramount importance saying that victims would have to be consulted on their safety and security needs. During the process, a justice would have had to consult the prosecutor to see whether the victim had anything else they should know about so they could implement related protections for her. That was completely tossed out. Having a victims' rights option in there to have her voice heard on what she needs would have been required. We know there are a lot of problems in our judicial system about victims not being consulted, but that was gutted as well. It is interesting, because with Keira's law, the victim's stepfather supported that provision.

Lastly, just to conclude, the original bill also made a peace bond last two to three years. It takes a lot of effort and courage to get peace bonds, and 12 months, especially for mothers, goes by quickly so they have to keep going back. We could have had a two- or three-year option for women. Now they would have to go back every 12 months. That was gutted by the Liberals.

It is deeply disappointing to see them prioritizing the abuser over the victim. We worked so hard to get this bill here. I would urge them to please consider our amendments. There are women's lives at stake. Let us do this together. Let us pass the strongest bill possible. Let us do it for women.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, this is another issue that should not be hijacked by partisanship.

I rise today to speak to a bill that is important for women who are victims of domestic violence. The Bloc Qu b cois is in favour of Bill S-205. This bill is consistent with the initiatives that have strengthened the justice and policing systems to address domestic violence. Gender-based violence is a scourge, and we believe that this bill is a step in the right direction for achieving this goal. To follow on the work we did in committee, we are maintaining our support for Bill S-205. The Bloc Qu b cois' position is consistent with the initiatives that seek to strengthen the mechanisms to better align the justice system with public safety, particularly to ensure better protection for victims of domestic violence.

I will give an overview of this bill and then talk a bit about parole and the reservations we have. I will close by talking about the progress made in Quebec on this matter.

First, I too would like to acknowledge Conservative Senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu, who appeared before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women.

Essentially, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Criminal Code to require a judge who is making a decision on the interim release of an accused person to ensure that the prosecutor has consulted the informant about their security needs. The bill would allow the judge to order the wearing of a monitoring device, commonly known as an electronic monitoring bracelet, when the prosecutor so requests. The purpose of the bill is to make it easier for the victim to obtain a copy of the order against the accused, and it requires the judge to ask the prosecutor whether the victim has been informed of the order. The bill also seeks to allow victims to lay an

information before a judge about their abuser, if they have reasonable grounds to fear for their physical safety or that of their child. If the fear is justified, the judge may order the defendant to enter into a recognizance under threat of imprisonment.

The bill also gives the judge the authority to set the conditions for a good behaviour recognizance by imposing such things as psychosocial follow-up, relocation to a geographic area other than that of the informant, the obligation to refrain from going to a specified place and the obligation to refrain from communicating directly or indirectly with a child, the informant, the informant's child or any relative or close friend of the informant. The bill also allows the judge to prohibit the abuser from using social media and consuming drugs, alcohol or other intoxicants and to require that they provide a sample to check compliance with this condition. The bill also permits the informant to provide submissions in writing to the judge regarding the conditions of the recognizance to be set by the judge.

Bill S-205 has three main components: the obligation to consult the victim before making a conditional release order; the addition of the concept of domestic violence, allowing a victim to apply to have the accused enter into a recognizance to keep the peace under the infamous section 810 of the Criminal Code; and the preponderance of the victim's version of events, which could influence the choice of conditions the defendant will be subject to under the recognizance.

Bill S-205 broadens the scope of section 810 of the Criminal Code, which empowers the court to order the defendant to enter into a recognizance to be of good behaviour if the victim fears that the defendant will cause personal injury to them, their child or their intimate partner or damage to their property. The bill adds relatives, close friends and other people who may be targeted to that list.

Let us not forget that release, with or without conditions, allows an accused person to be released into the community while awaiting trial. In Quebec and Canada, criminal law and penal law must punish crime and protect the public. With femicide and domestic violence on the rise, it is important to strengthen mechanisms for protecting victims, their children and their loved ones. Modernizing the Criminal Code is an essential part of that, and that is exactly what Bill S-205 does.

Private Members' Business

The Criminal Code sets out the conditions under which it would be justified to detain an accused person pending trial. The decision to detain a person awaiting trial depends on a number of factors specific to each situation. When it is in the public interest to detain an accused person, it is important to remember that the accused is deprived of the exercise of fundamental rights. These include the presumption of innocence and the right to life, liberty and security of the person.

Allowing the victim to be more involved in the legal process is a welcome improvement that the Bloc Québécois can support unreservedly. Victims should not have to fight for justice to be served. The bill will help reduce the obstacles that victims might encounter and that might dissuade them from taking the brave step of filing a complaint against their abuser. There might be gaps in the bill that could compromise certain fundamental rights, like the requirement to provide biological samples to prove that the defendant has not breached a recognizance to be of good behaviour.

● (1750)

We supported the amendment made in committee to clause 1, which deals with the criminal history of a violent intimate partner. The amendment excludes cases of limitation and focuses only on whether the person has already been convicted, regardless of which crime they have been charged with. This has the effect of covering a broader range of offences for the benefit of the victim. The same goes for the list of amendments in clause 2, which clarifies the legal definition of partners and their children, who are included in the risk assessment and the protections granted. For most of these amendments, it is a matter of aligning the amendment with the relevant section of the Criminal Code, as it currently stands. We heard that in committee from experts.

We are in favour of the amendments dealing with specialized services for first nations, although all citizens should be entitled to the best support services available. However, we are not in favour of reducing the maximum time the judge can order the defendant to be of good behaviour from 2 years to 12 months. I still do not understand why this amendment was made at committee. In recent news, we have seen that spouses can act years later, motivated by revenge. Finally, we are in favour of the new clause 10.1 proposed by the committee. It includes the new amendments to the Criminal Code regarding firearms and all other types of weapons. This new section allows the judge to determine whether to prohibit the defendant from possessing any firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, crossbow and prohibited device, for example.

In spite of our reservations regarding the bill as a whole, the Bloc Québécois will support it because it is commendable and seeks to make our communities safer, which is a net benefit for all Quebecers. A sense of security within communities reinforces a nation's well-being. If passed, these legislative changes will represent an added value for victims, including female victims of domestic or sexual violence. The justice system has to be more effective in general and more transparent, not least to facilitate the legal process and ease the long-term effects on victims or their family, especially when a decision is made about releasing the assailant. It also strengthens public trust in the justice system so that no other victim of a crime will hesitate to report it to the police. This is still a prob-

lem in 2024—victims are still reluctant to come forward and report their abusers.

Quebec is one of the most progressive nations when it comes to protecting victims of family and domestic violence. In fact, Quebec's department of public safety launched a Quebec-wide electronic monitoring device pilot project. In December 2022, more than 650 offenders on parole were fitted with such a device. Let us not forget that these are people being prosecuted for offences for which they could be sentenced to incarceration in a Quebec prison. Federal offenders were not subject to the same conditions. It is time to settle this discrepancy and make sure that all inmates released from prison are subject to the same restrictions.

Statistics show that femicide and domestic violence are on the rise. Between 2009 and 2019, there was an increase of 7.5%. The updated statistics are chilling, particularly the ones released by Statistics Canada this summer. In Quebec alone, 14 femicides occurred in 2024, and eight of those women were killed by their partner or former partner. The first femicide took place in the riding of Shefford. I would like to once again offer my condolences to the victim's loved ones, whom I had the opportunity to meet during a difficult time this summer. They decided to turn their tragic experience into something positive by organizing an event to help raise funds for Maison Alice-Desmarais, a shelter for women fleeing domestic violence. The shelter is located in Granby.

As I was saying, the situation is now catastrophic. It is imperative that we use this solution, which may not be perfect but is still the best solution. As we know, electronic bracelets with geolocation save lives. As parliamentarians, we have a responsibility to help reverse this disturbing trend. The reality on the ground highlights the shortcomings of the status quo that prevails in the justice system. Many victims continue to fear their abuser, even when that individual is in custody. We can only applaud an initiative that seeks to improve the victim's experience of the justice system throughout the process, starting from the moment she decides to file a complaint. I would like to point out that Quebec elected officials produced a non-partisan report entitled "Rebâtir la confiance", or rebuilding trust. Politics were set aside to tackle this problem. I say bravo for the specialized courts and the electronic monitoring bracelets.

In closing, the Bloc Québécois will stand up for women who are victims of domestic violence. Even one victim is one too many. Several communities have declared femicide an epidemic. We need to take action. I want to say one last thing. Last Friday, I marched with the Coalition des groupes de femmes de la Haute-Yamaska et de Brome-Missisquoi and many other groups from across Quebec. I was deeply moved to be joining those women once again this year.

Private Members' Business

• (1755)

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am rising to join tonight's debate on Bill S-205, a Senate public bill that is now before the House after a very long journey. It has gone through the Senate, and it is now before us for report stage and third reading. I believe we will come to the consequential votes of this particular bill tomorrow. Recently, of course, it has gone through six meetings at the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women. It finds itself here via former senator Pierre-Hugues Boisvenu and is now being sponsored here in the House by the member for Kildonan—St. Paul.

I also want to recognize another member, my NDP colleague the member for Winnipeg Centre, who is a member of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. Not only in her own riding but indeed right across this country, she has been a stalwart champion for women and for raising these particular issues. I know that our entire caucus is extremely proud of the work she does on this issue every day. We are certainly very grateful for the work she did as our caucus member of that standing committee so the House could consider the committee's work on the bill that is before us today.

Intimate partner violence is absolutely a national crisis, and we know that the statistics outline that in very stark ways. We know that about every six days, a woman in Canada is killed by her intimate partner. That statistic is very troubling to me personally, being a father of three daughters.

We know that globally, before COVID, one in three women experienced some form of intimate partner violence. We know that the rates are highest in households that are low-income and indigenous. There has been a surge in recent years in gender-based violence, including intimate partner violence. We know that the number of cases for women and girls in Canada involving a male accused increased by 27% in 2022 compared to before the pandemic in 2019. We know that in recognition of the massive surge of violence, the aforementioned Standing Committee on the Status of Women just recently undertook a study into this very important and concerning issue.

We know that the situation is dire. In several Canadian cities, places like Ottawa, where the House of Commons is located; Toronto; and Kitchener, this is recognized as an epidemic.

There is a role, of course, for us as federal legislators and for the federal government. We have jurisdiction over how the Criminal Code is structured, and indeed the bill before us has some important amendments to it. We cannot alone legislate ourselves out of the problem. It is worth repeating here, as many of my colleagues have consistently done, that the current Liberal government has implemented only two of the 231 calls for justice from the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.

In my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, there is a relatively high indigenous population. From speaking with many female indigenous members of my community, I know that this is a particularly galling statistic and one that they take great issue with. They feel that they are not being seen and that their personal cir-

cumstances are not rating high enough for the government's attention.

I also want to take some time to recognize the organizations that are working on the ground in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. There is the Cowichan Women Against Violence Society, which works from a feminist perspective to provide a supportive environment primarily to women and children who have been impacted by violence. It is there to support diversity, change, choice and growth through counselling, advocacy, emergency shelter services, community development and education. There is also the Victoria Women's Transition House, which has been supporting and advocating for women since 1974. That organization is active in the southern part of my riding, in the great city of Langford.

• (1800)

When we turn to Bill S-205, there are a number of elements. I do want to recognize that the bill is not in the same form as when the Senate handed it over to the House of Commons. I know that following those six meetings at the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, a number of amendments were made to the bill, and I know we have some report stage amendments before us. We will, as a House, be deciding on the final form that we eventually want to have.

Some notable elements in the bill include mentions of the use of electronic monitoring devices, and I think some of the biggest parts of the bill deal with the recognizance orders that could be put in place for survivors of intimate partner violence, which would allow judges to impose conditions on these or for a domestic counselling program.

If we were to delve into the bill and look at those recognizance orders, first of all, there are a lot of different examples in the bill. It should be noted that the overall purpose would be to prevent serious harm by imposing conditions on a person, which can ultimately restrict their behaviour or their movement and essentially be a barrier the court could impose to reduce the risk of them committing a future offence.

We have to go back to section 810 of the Criminal Code to find existing provisions, and this bill would add some amendments to those particular sections. For example, there could be an order to attend a treatment program, to remain within a specified geographic area, to wear an electronic monitoring device so the person's whereabouts are known at all times, to abstain from communicating, to refrain from using social media or to abstain from the consumption of drugs and alcohol. Again, these all could vary based on the facts of the case before the court.

I want to thank the member for Winnipeg Centre for her hard work. We, as a caucus, will continue to support this bill. We believe that through the provisions in this bill, the legislative changes would be of benefit to survivors of intimate partner violence. It would provide some of the legislative guardrails that are necessary.

However, we are not going to legislate ourselves out of this problem. This is one piece of the puzzle that we as legislators can have a positive impact on, but we have a responsibility as a society to act swiftly and decisively to prevent and eliminate intimate partner violence and to support survivors. Bill S-205, on balance, would be a step in the right direction, but I think many people who are listening to this debate and who have that lived experience would agree with me that the work is far from over. We certainly must keep this issue top of mind.

With that, I will conclude my remarks. I appreciate being able to speak to this particular issue on behalf of my constituents.

• (1805)

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am also here to speak to Bill S-205, an act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to another act regarding interim release and domestic violence recognizance orders.

Bill S-205 proposes amendments to the bail and peace bond provisions of the Criminal Code and the Youth Criminal Justice Act to address intimate partner violence, a cause that all of us in the House should be seized with. I will start by thanking the Standing Committee on the Status of Women for their work on the bill. The committee looked carefully at Bill S-205 and identified ways to strengthen it while maintaining the original spirit of the legislation. I also want to recognize the contributions and expertise of the witnesses, all of whom shared their diverse perspectives, which were often of a deeply personal nature.

Bill S-205 has two main components, bail and peace bonds, and I will touch on each of these in turn, starting with bail. Bill S-205, as passed by the Senate, proposed four changes to the Criminal Code related to bail. First, the bill would have required a justice, before making a bail order for an offence involving intimate partner violence, to ask the prosecutor whether the intimate partner of the accused had been consulted about their safety and security needs.

The committee voted in favour of removing this proposal because it would have been duplicative of existing bail provisions. Moreover, it could have had the unintended consequence of endangering victims. Under this proposal, victims could have had details about their safety needs revealed to an audience, potentially including the accused, in court. This goes against protecting their security. Victim support services are better positioned to discuss safety and security needs with the victim in a more private setting, without the accused present.

Second, Bill S-205 would have required bail courts to consider imposing a condition that the accused wear an electronic monitoring device, for any offence charged, at the request of the Crown. This provision was removed from the bill because, under section 515 of the Criminal Code, it is already possible to impose electronic monitoring. Explicitly adding it as an optional condition could result in it being routinely imposed, even where it is not warranted. Most importantly, this provision was removed because it runs counter to the approach of Bill C-233, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Judges Act regarding violence against an intimate partner, which received royal assent on April 27, 2023.

Private Members' Business

Bill C-233 ensures that electronic monitoring is specifically considered as a bail condition in cases of intimate partner violence. This tailored approach is crucial. It signals to judges that intimate partner violence is a crime for which electronic monitoring may be especially successful in protecting victims. If we had extended this condition to all offences, intimate partner violence would no longer be singled out for special consideration from judges. Our government supports the tailored approach of Bill C-233 to best protect women and other victims of intimate partner violence.

Third, Bill S-205 proposed amending the reverse onus bail provisions in section 515 of the Criminal Code. A reverse onus is where the accused must demonstrate that they should be released instead of the burden of proof being on the prosecutor to demonstrate that they should be detained. The proposed change would expand the existing intimate partner violence reverse onus for bail to apply not only to accused individuals who were previously convicted but also to those who were previously discharged on an intimate partner violence offence. This amendment remains in the bill and is identical to a change our government made in Bill C-48, which passed last year after receiving unanimous support in the House.

Finally, Bill S-205 would require the justice to ask the prosecutor if the victim has been informed of their right to have a copy of the bail order after a decision on bail has been made. I support this measure to improve transparency in the justice system and enhance victims' access to information.

Moving on to the peace bond regime, Bill S-205 would create a new peace bond focused on preventing domestic violence, which is understood as violence directed at an intimate partner or child of either partner. Peace bonds are entirely separate from criminal punishment or sentencing. They can be sought when there is a reasonable fear that a crime may occur, and they are designed to prevent crimes from taking place. The committee adopted several amendments to the peace bond proposed in Bill S-205, to strengthen the original intent of the bill.

[*Translation*]

For example, Bill S-205 proposed that the defendant's intimate partner be allowed to apply for a recognizance to keep the peace. This approach differs from existing recognizance to keep the peace provisions in the Criminal Code, which allow a person other than a person who may be a victim of the alleged offence, such as a police officer or a family member, to apply for the recognizance on their behalf.

Private Members' Business

• (1810)

[*English*]

The committee's amendments would ensure that the new domestic violence peace bond could be brought forward by someone on behalf of a person who fears that a crime will occur, as is the current practice for other peace bond regimes. I am somewhat surprised to see amendments from my Conservative colleagues to restrict this back to only the victims. This seems counterintuitive to a victim-centric approach.

[*Translation*]

The committee also made several amendments to ensure that the duration, conditions and procedures of the new recognizance to keep the peace provision are consistent with similar existing recognizance provisions in the Criminal Code.

For example, in the new provision, the maximum duration of the recognizance to keep the peace would be 12 months, or two years if there is a prior conviction, which is consistent with recognizance to keep the peace provisions that apply to organized crime, forced marriages, serious personal injury offences and sexual offences against a minor. Similarly, the maximum term of imprisonment for failure to sign a recognizance to keep the peace would be 12 months in order to align with all other recognizance to keep the peace provisions in the Criminal Code.

[*English*]

Bill S-205 also proposes conditions that could be imposed on a defendant in a peace bond. The committee made several changes to the list of conditions proposed, which included removing the condition requiring the defendant to refrain from using social media.

It is important to point out that peace bond conditions are not intended to be punitive, but preventative, and they are to be tailored to a specific threat. The use of social media could be interpreted broadly by the courts to include things such as job searches or shopping for second-hand furniture. While some uses of social media may be linked to a specific threat posed by the defendant, in many cases it may not be, yet breaching the condition would still be considered a criminal offence. Moreover, defendants in a peace bond would already be prohibited from contacting in any way or stalking the person who sought the peace bond, so the social media prohibition is not necessary for protection.

Next, I will speak to the peace bond condition that would require the defendant to refrain from going to specified places, such as the home or work of the intimate partner. This is essential to ensure the safety and security of the victim and is often the main reason for seeking a peace bond order.

The committee voted to expand this condition to further prohibit the defendant from going within a specified distance of a place to allow for the imposition of a radius within which the accused would be prohibited from going. For example, the condition could provide that the defendant must not go within 500 meters of the victim's home to prevent stalking behaviour, such as sitting in a car outside the victim's residence. I would support this amendment, which would strengthen the existing protections for victims of intimate partner violence. My colleagues across the way also appear to

want to repeal this amendment, which I am of the firm belief gives stronger protection to victims.

[*Translation*]

The last amendment I want to talk about was proposed as a result of an NDP motion to allow an alternative to the peace bond process when the informant or the defendant is indigenous. Under this change, the judge must determine whether it would be appropriate, instead of ordering a recognizance to keep the peace, to recommend that indigenous support services be provided if available. The purpose of this amendment is to address the overrepresentation of indigenous peoples in the criminal justice system by allowing the use of alternative justice methods for healing. I support this change.

To conclude, Bill S-205 makes targeted but important changes to criminal law to better address domestic violence.

[*English*]

I urge all members to support the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, many women helped create Bill S-205 by joining forces and working hard. I want to pay tribute to these women and their resilience. Their insights and hard work have led to the tabling of this legislation before us which seeks to strengthen the Criminal Code and to put in place preventive safety measures called interim release at the beginning of the legal process, when a woman decides to report the violence she has experienced.

I rise in the House to speak to a bill that proposes a solution to the issues that affect thousands of victims of domestic violence by providing them with the protection and supports they desperately need to regain their safety and dignity. Bill S-205 invites us to reflect on the fate of victims who have come to testify about how their domestic violence complaints were dealt with at the reporting stage by the police, as well as the entire process dedicated to such complaints.

I would especially like to talk about victims of sexual assault in sports, because over the past two years, as I reviewed the accounts of several athletes who were victims of violence and abuse, I realized to my great dismay how the system does not do justice to the victims. In routine court proceedings, lawyers agree on a number of things, such as a publication ban on the identity of the victim, a witness or a stakeholder in the justice system, even before the trial begins. What about the victim's right to lift the ban? One of the first things I noticed was how little opportunity there is in the system to consult with victims who are subject to a publication ban. That issue was pointed out by the people at My Voice, My Choice, whom I salute.

Private Members' Business

I rose several times in the House with the hope that the Prime Minister would open an independent, public inquiry into the sports and that this would highlight the absurdity of the mechanisms chosen to address violence and sexual assault, as well as the need to better protect our athletes and children. Why are athletes in vulnerable or power imbalance situations treated differently, outside the courts? That is a debate we should take the time to get into in the House.

When Rick Westhead's article came out, were it not for my intervention in the House and for the motion on Hockey Canada being adopted unanimously, what would have happened in the now high profile case of the alleged victim of gang rape by Hockey Canada players? Sport Canada was informed in June 2018, but did nothing. The chief of the London police apologized for not getting to the bottom of things at the time, and I could list everything the victim went through. The system allowed for the imposition of a non-disclosure agreement—or her silence in exchange for monetary compensation. Two years of work at the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage and public pressure help put this case back on track, where it should have been from the start. The victim, in this case, could apply to have the publication ban lifted at any time during the trial, when she feels safe enough to do so.

I see the similarities with Bill S-205. We must give victims back the power to decide whether or not to be informed. We should not be making decisions for them. We must give them tools to ensure they have some sense of safety, such as requiring the alleged abuser to wear an electronic device if they are released on bail. We must take the time to do the right thing and implement preventive safety measures. What do we know about “peace bonds”, often referred to as “810s” in legal jargon? We know the system uses them too often, and perhaps too quickly. Here again, we are confronted with that reality in each and every case that is reported in the newspapers. Orders issued under section 810 of the Criminal Code and the amount of red tape involved in filing complaints too often result in victims withdrawing their complaint.

I want to talk about indigenous women because, in rereading the testimony heard in the Senate, and given my role in connection to indigenous relations, I paid close attention to testimony from the Native Women's Association of Canada, represented by Sarah Niman, the organization's legal counsel. I would like to echo those voices. I am addressing my colleagues with a deep concern for indigenous women who, when they experience violence, are often abandoned by a system that is supposed to protect them. Too often, when an indigenous woman finds the courage to ask for help, she is confronted with a system that turns its back on her.

• (1815)

Instead of protecting her, the Criminal Code allows the abuser to remain free and keep hurting her while we wait for a solution to be found. The wait can seem endless at times, however. It is unacceptable that the safety of an indigenous woman should depend on her ability to persuade others of her worth and her right to protection.

That is why we must support Bill S-205. This bill is far more than a piece of legislation. It is the promise of justice. It seeks to redefine our approach to violence against indigenous women by putting their safety and security at the heart of the legal process.

Bill S-205 not only creates specific intervention for indigenous women, it establishes a framework that will allow them to be seen, heard and respected in a system that too often ignores them.

This bill puts the criminal justice system under an obligation to consider the safety of victims at every stage, from the initial request for assistance until the end of the proceedings. The time has come to give victims a voice and restore their power to choose a path to justice. By supporting this bill, we are taking a decisive step toward a more just society where every woman, no matter her background, deserves to be safe and protected.

We are in favour of the amendments on specialized services for first nations, even though all citizens should be entitled to the best support services available. The Bloc Québécois is in favour of most of the measures set out in Bill S-205. Allowing victims to be more involved in the legal process that concerns them is a good step forward that the Bloc Québécois can fully support. Victims should not have to go to great lengths to seek justice. The bill helps to reduce the obstacles that victims may face and that may dissuade them from courageously pursuing their complaint against their abuser.

We support the amendment made in committee to clause 1, pertaining to the criminal record of a violent intimate partner. The same goes for the list of amendments to clause 2 to clarify the legal definition of partners and the children of partners and include them in the risk assessment and the protections that are granted. We are opposed to reducing the maximum period of good behaviour from two years to 12 months. Finally, the committee improved the bill with a provision that enables judges to decide whether to prohibit the accused from possessing prohibited and restricted firearms, prohibited devices and crossbows.

Quebec is recognized as one of the most progressive nations when it comes to protecting victims of family violence. It has rolled out some promising initiatives, including electronic monitoring devices that help keep victims safer by restricting the movements of abusers. As of December 2022, more than 850 offenders had already been fitted with these devices. However, we know that challenges remain. The same protections do not apply to persons convicted at the federal level. It is imperative to standardize the conditions of release for all abusers so that all victims are kept safe, free from discrimination or distinction.

The legislative changes we are proposing will genuinely benefit victims, especially women affected by domestic or sexual violence. We need to make our justice system more efficient and more transparent. This requires clear and timely decisions regarding the release of abusers. However, it also demands greater awareness, so that all victims can report crimes without fear.

Adjournment Proceedings

The numbers are chilling. The Quebec government's report on rebuilding trust noted an alarming 7.5% increase in femicide and domestic violence between 2009 and 2019. As parliamentarians, we have a responsibility to reverse this worrying trend. The reality on the ground demonstrates that many victims continue to live in fear of their abuser, even when he or she is in custody. This is unacceptable. It is essential to create an environment in which victims feel supported, listened to and protected. That is our duty.

• (1820)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 12.

• (1825)

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.

[*English*]

Mr. Mel Arnold: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, September 25, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 2 to 12.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Madam Speaker, at a time when our country is facing historic challenges, Canadians are facing the doubling costs of everything. Food price inflation is at record highs. The cost of rent has doubled. The cost of mortgages has doubled. Even the needed down payment has doubled.

Today, common-sense Conservatives put forward a motion calling for a carbon tax election, declaring that we have lost confidence in the government. That loss of confidence is born out of what we have heard from Canadians, who are struggling. They cannot afford to eat. They cannot afford to buy a home. They cannot afford to rent a home. They can barely afford a tent to live in. Tent encampments are increasing in size in communities across this country. There is desperation from Canadians.

It was not like this before. What has changed? One thing that has changed is that the government has decided to put its friends first and help its friends line their pockets while Canadians are lined up at food banks. There are incredible examples, like the \$21 billion that the NDP-Liberal government spent on outside consultants last year, on their buddies at McKinsey and their buddies at GC Strategies with the \$60-million arrive scam scandal.

The Liberals are lining the pockets of their friends with wanton disregard for the effects that their inflationary spending is having on Canadians. They like to talk about all of the help they are going to give to Canadians sometime in the future. However, Canadians would not need the scale of rescue that the government proposes if it were not for the injury being caused by that same NDP-Liberal government.

Inflationary spending, corruption and graft are what we have seen after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, and it is Canadians who are paying the price, not just through the cost of servicing the debt that has been racked up, but also with the lack of available funds to take care of what matters most to Canadians. That says nothing of the fact that the Liberals' carbon tax on everything does nothing to help our environment, but drives up the price of absolutely everything. They want to see it raised to over 60¢ a litre. It is a tax on the farmer who grows the food, the trucker who moves it, the grocer who sells it, the food processors and of course the Canadians who buy it.

It is economic vandalism after nine years of these NDP-Liberals, and Canadians need relief. Why will the government not just give Canadians a carbon tax election so they can decide?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find the member opposite's speech and question a bit melodramatic, but he is known for that in this House.

As the hon. member is aware, the CBSA initiated an internal investigation as soon as there were allegations of inappropriate contracting practices. The matter was also referred to the RCMP for investigation. Contracts with three companies involved, including GC Strategies, have also been suspended through a stop work order from Public Services and Procurement Canada.

Adjournment Proceedings

FINANCE

We expect procurement processes to be followed properly, and anyone who does not follow contracting rules will face appropriate consequences. This has been and will always be the case. The procurement ombud's and the Auditor General's reports have identified unacceptable gaps in management processes, roles and controls. Some recommendations have already been implemented and the CBSA is taking further action to ensure practices are aligned with policies and meet the expectations of Canadians. The government is taking steps to ensure that all departments are better positioned to undertake projects of this nature in the future.

Regarding ongoing investigations into alleged misconduct, the RCMP is assessing all available information, including the Auditor General's performance audit report, and will take appropriate action. To protect the integrity of the investigation, the RCMP will not be providing any further information at this time. We know that a pillar of our democracy is to have independent police services and there should be no interference in the RCMP's investigation. I can also confirm that the president of the CBSA similarly referred allegations of misconduct received in 2022 to its professional integrity division, which has been actively working on its administrative investigation since then, and which has also referred the allegations to the RCMP.

This government remains committed to act on the findings of all audits, reviews and investigations.

● (1830)

Mr. Michael Barrett: Madam Speaker, I think that Canadians will find that response to be wholesale inadequate.

I will take a minute to say that I want to wish my mom a very happy birthday. It is her 71st birthday today. I had the delight to have breakfast with her this morning. It is because of my mom that I have such a strong interest in our wonderful country, standing up for what is so important, and accountability and affordability. These are things that are crucial to Canadians and are values that were instilled in me by my wonderful mom.

I just want to ask the parliamentary secretary: Will the Liberals just give Canadians a carbon tax election so they can decide on having a government that will bring home an affordable country?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I will say “no” as a direct answer to the member's question, but I will offer to sing “happy birthday” to his mom if he so chooses. I do wish the member's mother a happy birthday as I have wished my mother a happy birthday fairly recently. She is a bit older than the member opposite's mom, but taught me the same values of accountability and affordability, those principles that I hold dear.

I agree with the member that we need to hold our institutions accountable and our public servants accountable. We need to hold ourselves accountable. I understand that we take the concerns that the member has raised very seriously.

This government is committed to transparency and accountability. We acknowledge that the procurement ombud's and the Auditor General's reports have identified gaps in management processes, rules and controls at the CBSA and we have acted through numerous ways that I have detailed in my longer response. Transparency in the management of these processes is paramount.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to a question I raised in the House back in the spring session, shortly after the budget was delivered, when the government issued more debt and extended the debt it was going to visit upon Canadians.

I asked that because the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions talked about follow-on risks of the added debt the government was bringing into the financial equation for Canadians. Those follow-on risks include things such as stress in the mortgage insurance industry, investment portfolio risk, asset management risk and insurance risk. These are things the government does not have its eye on when it loads on more and more money. It keeps extending the balance sheet, not just to the government, but also its Crown corporations.

The Bank of Canada's balance sheet is expanding its liabilities, and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation is expanding its balance sheet with more liabilities. This is more risk for Canadians. That risk is borne in higher costs throughout the financial system and Canadians eventually bear that. They bear that because the government manages Canadians' money and pulls the money in. It is no wonder the government is raising taxes because there are more bills to pay. The primary part of the bill, of course, is ever-rising interest on the debt that they are incurring. This is a house of cards.

At the time, I stated that the finance minister needed to redo the budget because, frankly, it was not delivering for Canadians. The government is spending way beyond our means and loading a whole bunch of burden onto future Canadian taxpayers. At that point in time, the parliamentary secretary's response to me was that it is a hard time for Canadians, but then tried to blame rising mortgage costs on Conservatives, as if we have been in government causing all of this mayhem in the Canadian financial system.

I am going to go back to what the Prime Minister said years ago when he talked about the Canadian government taking on a whole bunch of debt so Canadians do not have to. The issue is that both have happened. The government's debt-to-GDP ratio is now 107%. It is referenced in the International Monetary Fund's own disclosure documents, which I referred to last week in a previous session. That amount is excessive, and we recognize how high that is. However, the parliamentary secretary tried to tell me last week that it is only 40%. It was, frankly, misinformation. It is in the government's own documents and exists nowhere else in the world. Government debt in Canada is 107% of our GDP. Liberals can reference that, and Canadians can reference that any time they want.

Adjournment Proceedings

If we add to that the Canadian debt that is held by the public, that is about 102% of GDP. If the government debt, all in, is \$2.1 trillion, counting both provincial and federal debt, and the Canadian consumer debt is about \$2.5 trillion, we are talking about a massive 209% minimum debt-to-GDP ratio in this country. There is no other country in the world, frankly, with such an offside both on the consumer side and on the government side. This whole thing about issuing debt for the benefit of Canadians, when the government is also incurring a whole bunch of debt, is only layering on. I will get back to the cost of this.

I would like to hear what my colleague across the way has to say about how the Liberals are going to manage this debt and get things under control.

• (1835)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, our government continues to manage Canada's public finances responsibly. I know the member opposite seems to disagree with that, but he should remember that our debt service costs are the lowest in the G7 when compared to GDP, as 0.6% of GDP is the cost to service the national debt. Also, contrary to what the member has said, the International Monetary Fund has rated Canada number one in the world in terms of budget balance and also gives Canada a number one ranking in the G7, expecting the largest GDP growth in 2025.

In fact, Canada has done fairly well in the grand scheme of things. The COVID-19 pandemic had a massive impact on the world economy. There were lots of losses of revenue and lots of interruptions to supply chains. It was one of the biggest economic dips one could see, probably at least in the last 100 years. We have recovered quite quickly from that, which is good news for Canadians. Our government is quite proud of our record of support to Canadians during that time, which has allowed us to recover quickly.

Some of that debt, obviously, Canada now services, but at a much lower rate and with a AAA credit rating, which we have maintained. We also know that Canada is leading the G7 in achieving a soft landing from the postpandemic surge in inflation and high interest rates. The Bank of Canada was the first central bank in the G7 to cut interest rates since the recent global hiking cycle, first to cut it twice and first to cut it a third time.

This is something I think all Canadians should recognize. Certainly the member opposite should admit that it is a very positive sign for Canada's recovery postpandemic that we are the first country to do three rate cuts with our central bank. The Bank of Canada has said that Canada's budget has stuck to its fiscal guardrails that were set out in last year's fall economic statement, and that was exactly why inflationary pressures were alleviated from the economy. It said the government managed its resources in such a way as to ensure that those interest rates could start to come down faster.

This is helping people who have a mortgage coming up for renewal. It is helping people with variable rate mortgages immediately. It is helping people looking to buy a first home. This is helping business owners from coast to coast who may be carrying debt. Interest rates are falling because inflation has come down. It

has come down for many months in a row, from over 8% to now 2%, which is right at the Bank of Canada's target rate.

This is really good news for Canadians. Things are looking up. Canada's economy is recovering. I know that the member opposite and I can debate fiercely, but I think the facts speak for themselves. Even our Parliamentary Budget Officer recently came out with a report that showcased that Canada could spend over \$40 billion more per year. That is not the intention of this government, of course, but it was interesting to hear the Parliamentary Budget Officer say there is actually fiscal room there. To hear these independent experts actually say that our government has—

• (1840)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, there was a whole bunch of misinformation. There were some facts in there, but there was a whole bunch of fiction as well, and I will go through some of that.

Number one, the OECD predicts Canada being one of the worst-performing economies over the next decade. He can reference that. When he talked about the IMF's status about where Canada sits, he completely misled this House and Canadians, and frankly, we have had enough of it.

Let us look at the rising cost of debt in Canada, because that is what matters. Canadians have about \$5,600 of debt payments between what governments pay and what they have to pay themselves. That is about \$14,000 per household. After tax, if we think about it, an average salary in Canada is \$60,000 or \$120,000 if done by two, \$14,000 is 20% of some people's income.

Can the member explain how he is going to get that rate down?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I am proud of our government's track record on managing the resources of this country in a way that is responsible and on stewarding our country through some very challenging economic times. Again, I do not need to remind the member about the pandemic, but I will anyway; I think he has amnesia when it comes to understanding the economic impacts of a global pandemic, a once-in-a-hundred-year public health crisis. I also know that he wants to conveniently forget about the fact that the rest of the world is dealing with the inflationary pressures that Canada has been dealing with.

Adjournment Proceedings

Canada has fared much better than many other peer countries around the world. We have had inflation come down to the Bank of Canada's target rate. We have stuck to our fiscal guardrails. The IMF has rated Canada number one in terms of budget balance and number one when it comes to GDP growth in 2025, which is next year. Canada is faring very well. We have the highest per capita foreign direct investment. We have recovered over two million jobs in the postpandemic recovery. Things are looking bright for this country.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Madam Speaker, I stand before members with a heavy heart today to share some stories of moms and dads whom I heard from over the course of the summer. They shared with me the heartbreaking truth that they just cannot afford the quality food that they want to give their kids. These are proud parents who have done everything right. They work hard and play by the rules, yet they find they are struggling not to get ahead but just to get by. They told me of the feeling of looking into the eyes of their little ones and of the desperation in being unable to fulfill the most basic need by providing a healthy, decent meal for their kids.

I also spoke with many seniors, the very individuals who built this country, who are now faced with an unbearable reality. I vividly recall one senior who had tears forming in her eyes as she told me how her rent and utility bill increases have made it near impossible to afford anything else. She cannot afford fresh fruit, fresh veggies or anything that she wants to enjoy her passion with, which is cooking. She can barely afford to feed herself, never mind feeding anyone else. She told me she thought she had a good pension, and she saved her whole life; however, she cannot stretch these dollars any further. She told me that this was not the Canada she remembered, and it was not the retirement she expected.

For these folks, their spirits are shattered when they have to line up at a food bank, empty-handed and exhausted, just to pick up a few extra meals to get through to the end of the month. They told me that they feel like a burden, or worse, a failure on behalf of their family. They do not want to have to ask their family and friends for help. I respect that pride, but they should not have to feel this way.

Let us not forget the staggering truth that the number of Canadians relying on food banks has reached an all-time high. This is not the Canada that these Canadians, nor any of us, were promised. I grew up believing that, if we went to school, worked hard and played by the rules, no dream was too big and retirement with dignity would not be out of reach. However, many are left wondering how they are going to afford dinner instead.

The government has let Canadians down. It has pushed them to the brink, to a feeling of loneliness and failure. I would be shocked if Liberal and NDP colleagues did not hear the same story, or one very similar, over the course of the summer.

Now, I expect my colleague across the way will respond to this question with talking points about how great all the Liberals' care programs are. However, no government program could ever restore the lost pride of those parents or those retirees.

According to Harvest Manitoba, food bank usage surged by 150% between 2019 and 2023. How many more families will have to suffer? How many will have to line up in desperation before the government recognizes its own failures? How many more families must line up at a food bank before the Liberals finally axe the tax and recognize that, if we tax the farmer who grows the food, the trucker who ships the food and the grocer who sells the food, we put a tax on all Canadians? How bad does it have to get until they realize their failed policies have caused this? How long until the Liberals and the NDP take a good, long look in the mirror and realize that their policies, while perhaps well intentioned, are the cause of this misery for so many Canadians?

● (1845)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was a little shocked to hear the hon. member call some of our programs and the things we stand for and have been implementing, “all of [those] care programs”, as if they can be lumped into some nebulous, unintelligible phrase. It seems to me a shame that he does not understand the value of pharmacare, dental care, mental health care and the health care investments we have made. All of the care programs he has spoken of are designed to help lift people up, care for them and help with the affordability challenges that Canadians are facing. Maybe that is just an aside.

I would like to get back to the heart of the member's question, which I think was focused, at least from what was tabled in the House, on the housing crisis. I can assure the member that the crisis is not unique to Manitoba and is not unique to any part of this country; it is actually all across the country. The housing crisis has been around since long before the current government was in power.

In fact, the current government put forward the national housing strategy. One of the reasons I stepped up in 2019 and put my name on a ballot was that for the first time in 30 years, I saw a federal government willing to invest in housing in a meaningful way. It made a big, bold commitment to reducing homelessness, to helping solve the affordable housing challenges that Canadians were facing. The plan, with significant investments of over \$70 billion over 10 years, was a really big reason for my wanting to get involved in politics.

Adjournment Proceedings

Certainly, the housing challenges have morphed and changed, and the market has shifted. I admit that there are significant challenges. I feel passionate about this issue. I feel compassion for every Canadian who either cannot afford to buy a home or who is struggling with affordability challenges and is at risk of homelessness. That is something the government takes very seriously. We have put effort, time and energy into developing a strategy and implementing real solutions, not slogans, like “axe the tax”, which are false signifiers that have no meaning and are going to help not one person with getting housed in this country.

We are waiving GST on new rental construction. We are helping non-profits purchase housing stock that would otherwise become unaffordable or be bought up. We are helping co-operatives develop more housing with \$1.5 billion in support for them. We are working with municipalities through the housing accelerator fund to make it easier and faster to get shovels in the ground and to improve medium density and other forms of housing density that will lower the cost for Canadians. We have just made mortgage rule changes that will help more and more Canadians access a lower-cost mortgage. Individuals who rent will be able to have their responsible rental history count toward their acquiring a mortgage in the future.

These are all positive steps and real solutions that are helping people, not to mention the historic investment we have made in the national housing strategy that has helped over 500,000 Canadians right across this country to get housing, or to maintain or repair housing if it was in disarray.

• (1850)

Mr. Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, I think that the member's response is a great example of the false reality Liberal-NDP members live in, where everything is fine. I talked about suffering, and he offered compassion. Compassion is fine, but Liberals caused the problem and are trying to offer fake solutions to fix the problem they caused; this is why Canadians are so upset. They want to be left alone. They want to work hard. They want to play by the rules.

They want to earn a good-quality living with powerful paycheques to pay for their family's food and living expenses and to help the next generation get ahead.

However, all of a sudden, the Liberals have the idea to quadruple the size of the carbon tax to make it 61¢ a litre. Do they think that is going to have no impact on the quality of life of Canadians now and in the future? It is remarkable to me that they can live in this false reality. How do they wake up in the morning and think everything is fine if they talk to anybody in their ridings and recognize it is not?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, it is interesting that the member talks about a false reality. From where I sit, it is the Conservatives that have a false reality. They are unhinged from reality. In fact, they offer zero solutions. They offer three-word slogans, and others such as “powerful paycheques”. What the heck does that mean? I have no clue what the Conservative Party means by that. It is a false promise.

It is something that the Conservatives keep repeating over and over again. They think it sounds good. They think, somehow, it is going to light up people's brains in some fancy way or give people some emotional response and then they are going to vote for the Conservative Party. That makes no sense. It is not going to solve the affordable housing crisis.

We put forward a plan with real solutions and are investing significant dollars because Canada has a great balance sheet. We are doing that to benefit Canadians, to help them get housed, to help solve homelessness and to help solve the affordable housing crisis.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 6:54 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:54 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, September 24, 2024

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Auditor General of Canada

The Speaker 25759

Committees of the House

Indigenous and Northern Affairs

Mr. Weiler 25759

Petitions

Lebanon

Ms. Diab 25759

Pakistan

Ms. Sahota 25759

Children and Families

Mr. Aboultaif 25759

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 25759

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government

Mr. Poilievre 25760

Motion 25760

Ms. Gould 25762

Mr. Savard-Tremblay 25763

Mr. Singh 25763

Mr. Nater 25763

Points of Order

Alleged Unparliamentary Language

Ms. Collins (Victoria) 25764

Ms. Gazan 25764

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government

Motion 25764

Ms. Gould 25764

Ms. Gould 25764

Mr. Doherty 25766

Mr. Therrien 25767

Mr. Angus 25767

Mr. Hardie 25767

Mr. Lemire 25768

Mr. Therrien 25768

Mr. Deltell 25769

Ms. Gould 25770

Ms. Collins (Victoria) 25770

Ms. Larouche 25770

Mr. Doherty 25772

Mr. Angus 25772

Ms. Gould 25773

Mr. Singh 25773

Mr. Doherty 25775

Ms. Murray 25775

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné 25775

Mr. Boulerice 25775

Points of Order

Alleged Unparliamentary Language—Speaker's Ruling

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes) 25777

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government

Motion 25777

Mr. Falk (Provencher) 25777

Mr. Lemire 25778

Mr. Angus 25778

Mr. Berthold 25778

Mr. Blois 25780

Mr. Savard-Tremblay 25780

Mr. Angus 25781

Mr. Doherty 25781

Mr. Lamoureux 25782

Mr. Lemire 25783

Mr. McLean 25783

Mr. Blois 25783

Mr. Davidson 25785

Mr. Perron 25785

Mr. Cannings 25786

Mr. Lamoureux 25786

Mr. Doherty 25787

Mr. Villemure 25787

Ms. Gazan 25788

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 25788

Mr. Blois 25789

Mr. Villemure 25790

Mr. MacGregor 25790

Mr. Steinley 25790

Mr. Hallan 25790

Mr. Sorbara 25792

Mr. Perron 25792

Mr. Angus 25792

Mr. Arnold 25793

Ms. Kayabaga 25793

Ms. Rood 25794

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Albert “Alby” Bishop	
Mr. Morrice	25794
National Day for Truth and Reconciliation	
Mr. Miao	25795
Birthday Congratulations	
Mr. Barlow	25795
St. John's East	
Ms. Thompson	25795
Stéphane Grenier	
Ms. Bérubé	25795
Newfoundland and Labrador Summer Games	
Mr. McDonald	25795
Liberal Party of Canada	
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	25796
Sport in Brampton South	
Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South)	25796
Seniors	
Mr. Carr	25796
Bloc Québécois	
Mr. Godin	25796
Gayle Christie	
Ms. Sgro	25796
Vehicle Theft	
Mr. Shipley	25797
Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Vis	25797
Military Family Appreciation Day	
Mrs. Brière	25797
Opioids	
Mr. Angus	25797
Maude Charron	
Ms. Michaud	25798
Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Kram	25798
Vehicle Theft	
Ms. Khalid	25798

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy	
Mr. Poilievre	25798
Mr. Duclos	25798
Mr. Poilievre	25798
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	25799
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	25799
Mr. Holland	25799

Mr. Poilievre	25799
Mr. Holland	25799
Mr. Poilievre	25799
Ms. Gould	25799
Seniors	
Mr. Therrien	25800
Mr. MacKinnon	25800
Mr. Therrien	25800
Mr. MacKinnon	25800
Health	
Mr. Singh	25800
Mr. Holland	25800
Mr. Singh	25800
Mr. Holland	25800
Carbon Pricing	
Ms. Lantsman	25800
Mr. Guilbeault	25801
Ms. Lantsman	25801
Mr. Guilbeault	25801
Mr. Barlow	25801
Mr. Wilkinson	25801
Mr. Barlow	25801
Mrs. Brière	25801
The Economy	
Mr. Berthold	25801
Ms. Freeland	25802
Mr. Berthold	25802
Mr. Champagne	25802
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	25802
Mr. Chiang	25802
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	25802
Mr. Duclos	25802
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	25802
Mr. Duclos	25802
Housing	
Mrs. Gray	25803
Mr. Fragiskatos	25803
Mrs. Gray	25803
Mr. Fragiskatos	25803
Taxation	
Mr. Morantz	25803
Ms. Freeland	25803
Public Safety	
Mr. Jivani	25803
Ms. O'Connell	25804
Health	
Ms. McPherson	25804
Mr. Holland	25804
Ms. Zarrillo	25804
Mr. Holland	25804
Public Safety	
Mr. Sorbara	25804

Mr. Virani	25804
Forestry Industry	
Mr. Martel	25804
Mr. Guilbeault	25805
Mr. Martel	25805
Mr. Guilbeault	25805
Mr. Paul-Hus	25805
Mr. Guilbeault	25805
The Environment	
Mr. Deltell	25805
Mr. Guilbeault	25805
Access to Information	
Mr. Champoux	25805
Mr. Duclos	25805
Mr. Champoux	25806
Ms. Khera	25806
International Trade	
Mr. Williams	25806
Ms. Ng	25806
Mr. Williams	25806
Ms. Ng	25806
Mr. Zimmer	25806
Ms. Ng	25806
Indigenous Affairs	
Mrs. Chatel	25807
Ms. Hajdu	25807
International Trade	
Mr. Seeback	25807
Ms. Freeland	25807
Mr. Seeback	25807
Ms. Freeland	25807
Mr. Hoback	25807
Ms. Gould	25807
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	
Mr. Casey	25808
Ms. Hutchings	25808
The Environment	
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	25808
Mr. Guilbeault	25808
Mr. Angus	25808
Mr. Wilkinson	25808

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Motion for concurrence	25808
Motion agreed to	25810
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Ms. Mathysen	25810

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government

Motion	25810
Ms. Dzerowicz	25810
Mr. Ellis	25812
Ms. Pauzé	25812
Mr. MacGregor	25812
Mr. Paul-Hus	25813
Mr. Lamoureux	25814
Ms. Pauzé	25814
Ms. Zarrillo	25815
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	25815
Mr. Reid	25815
Mr. Lamoureux	25816
Mr. Trudel	25817
Ms. Zarrillo	25817
Mr. Sorbara	25817
Ms. Ferreri	25819
Mr. Lemire	25819
Mr. MacGregor	25819
Mr. Morrice	25820
Mr. Jowhari	25820
Mr. Thériault	25821
Mr. Desjarlais	25821
Ms. Lantsman	25822
Mr. Hardie	25823
Mr. Thériault	25823
Mr. Morrice	25824
Mr. MacGregor	25824
Mr. Moore	25824
Mr. Lamoureux	25825
Mrs. Desbiens	25826
Ms. Zarrillo	25826
Ms. Dancho	25826
Division on motion deferred	25827

Points of Order

Alleged Violation of Standing Order 116 at Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Mr. Williamson	25827
----------------------	-------

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill S-205. Report stage	25828
Mr. Genuis	25828
Ms. Dancho	25828
Ms. Larouche	25830
Mr. MacGregor	25832
Mr. Hanley	25833
Mr. Lemire	25834
Division on motion deferred	25836

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Public Services and Procurement

Mr. Barrett 25836
Mr. Turnbull 25836

Finance

Mr. McLean 25837

Mr. Turnbull 25838

The Economy

Mr. Leslie 25839

Mr. Turnbull 25839

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>