



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 343
Wednesday, September 25, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 25, 2024

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Toronto—St. Paul's.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

MASKWA AQUATIC CLUB

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Maskwa Aquatic Club on celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Nestled in the waters of Kearney Lake in Halifax West, Maskwa is one of Canada's largest, and most committed and accomplished paddling clubs. It is where many in my community learned to swim, took out their first canoe or kayak, got summer work experience or first hiked through Blue Mountain-Birch Cove Lakes.

After an incredibly well-decorated 2023, Maskwa has done the unthinkable and, for a second year in a row, was victorious in the Canoe Kayak Canada Sprint National Championships.

I send a special shout-out to my constituents, Maskwa athletes Emilee Vaters and Matthew Brown who just represented Canada in the 2024 Olympic Hopes Regatta in Hungary. Congratulations to head coach Christian Hall, commodore Peter Giles, the board, coaches, athletes, parents and supporters.

We are all proud of their accomplishments and here is to the next 50 years.

* * *

RAIL SAFETY WEEK

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, September 23 to 29 marks Rail Safety Week. This week serves as a reminder of the importance of keeping our railways and our train yards safe. As we acknowledge the

tragedies of the past, we must recommit to the safety of our railways going forward.

Our railway workers keep our economy moving. They keep Canadians moving. More importantly, they keep Canadians safe. The work they do every day does not go unnoticed. Every year, 375 million tonnes of freight move across our rails. Millions of passengers are taken safely to their destination.

Conservatives will always be there to stand up for our rail workers because they are always there to protect the safety of Canadians. I thank them for keeping Canadians moving safely.

* * *

ASTHMA CANADA

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an organization close to my heart, Asthma Canada, celebrating its 50th anniversary this year.

In 1974, patients, parents, community members and leading physicians created an organization dedicated to helping Canadians with asthma lead healthy lives. Since then, its mission has been to ensure Canadians living with asthma enjoy a symptom-free life.

There are 4.6 million Canadians who live with asthma; I am one of them. Asthma attacks lead to approximately 70,000 hospitalizations and 250 deaths every year. It is serious.

As the former president and CEO of Asthma Canada, I saw the hard work done by physicians, nurses, researchers, educators, administrators and volunteers striving to engage, advocate, inform and treat people living with asthma in a patient-centred health charity.

Congratulations, Asthma Canada, on 50 years of excellent work. We look forward to 50 more years.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

ASSOCIATION DES LIBRAIRES DU QUÉBEC AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year, the Association des libraires du Québec, the Quebec booksellers association, presented its award of excellence to my bookseller, Philippe Fortin-Villeneuve, from Librairie Marie-Laura.

Philippe is a real bookworm. If someone asks him about the great classics of Quebec literature, philosophy or sociology, he can make recommendations without even batting an eye. This champion of publishing, this knowledge-sharing literary scholar, has been a breath of fresh air for all readers in Saguenay with his great recommendations.

I would urge everyone to go and meet him. His overwhelming enthusiasm is enough to turn anyone into an avid reader.

This is the third time that Librairie Marie-Laura has won this prestigious award. Once again, my region is showing that, when it comes to literature, we are no dummies.

As Dany Laferrière said, “Reading is not necessary for the body, only oxygen is, but a good book oxygenates the mind.” I hope Philippe will help us oxygenate our minds for a long time to come.

* * *

● (1410)

[English]

LA FESTA DEGLI ANZIANI

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I had the great pleasure of attending La Festa Degli Anziani with a group from the Giuseppe Garibaldi Seniors Club. This event, to mark National Seniors Day, which will be celebrated on October 1, was an opportunity to highlight and be grateful for the contributions of our seniors in our communities.

[Translation]

Whether it was bringing the retirement age back down to 65 after the Conservatives raised it to 67, creating the Canadian dental care plan, which has helped thousands of seniors get the health care they need, or increasing the guaranteed income supplement by 10%, our government has demonstrated its commitment to seniors time and time again.

[English]

We have reduced, by 11%, the number of seniors living in poverty. That means thousands of lives have been improved by our measures.

[Translation]

For such things as their words of wisdom and ongoing community involvement, we think our seniors are worth it.

[English]

NIAGARA WEST

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to thank the constituents of my beautiful riding of Niagara West for the honour of choosing me to represent their voices in Parliament.

I would also like to recognize the parents, teachers and students from Heritage Christian School who are in Ottawa today.

I spoke with many of my constituents over the summer and the overwhelming message for the Liberal government was to call an election. Why? These are some of the issues they brought up. There are skyrocketing prices for basic items like food and other groceries. Folks mentioned the price of gas, which keeps going up and up. In my riding, a car is a necessity, not a luxury. They said that taxes were making it impossible to pay the bills. With respect to the carbon tax, everyone wanted the horrible tax scheme scrapped. People were worried about paying for housing, which has doubled over the last nine years. They mentioned the rising levels of crime, car thefts and drug addictions.

Canadians want an election where they can choose a strong, majority Conservative government that will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

* * *

DENNIS SMITH

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at heart Dennis Smith was a storyteller. He applied this gift as a teacher to impart knowledge and insights to his students about the world around them.

Following a career in education, Dennis made the leap to politics. He was a campaign volunteer and then a constituency assistant to both my predecessor Clifford Lincoln and me.

Dennis worked for the “no” side in the 1995 Quebec referendum and was a leader in Pointe-Claire’s successful bid to regain its independent city status in Quebec’s municipal demerger referendums in 2004. He then served three terms as a highly regarded Pointe-Claire city councillor.

After retiring from politics, Dennis remained active in community affairs, including, among other things, acting as a sounding board and wise counsel to public office holders like me.

Dennis Smith believed in education and the politics of reason as fundamental to society’s progress. To his wife Karen and son Adam, we extend our deepest condolences.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

FRANCO-ONTARIAN DAY

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I join all francophones and francophiles across Ontario in celebrating Franco-Ontarian Day. On this day we proudly celebrate our francophone heritage. We are a strong community united by our love for our language and our desire to see it thrive for generations to come.

In my beautiful riding of Orléans, we are fortunate to have the MIFO community centre, a vital organization that supports the francophone community in Ottawa and to the east. The announcement of a federal investment to build the new MIFO is a step forward in solidifying its reach.

I would also like to take a moment to pay tribute to a notable francophone from Orléans, Denis Gagnon, who passed away on September 12. He was a key pillar in the francophone community, and he inspired us with his monthly columns in *L'Orléanais*.

I would like to thank Denis and wish all Franco-Ontarians a great day.

* * *

● (1415)

BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, like millions of Canadians and Quebecers, no longer have confidence in this Prime Minister and this government. The NDP has kept this government on life support for months, and now the Bloc Québécois wants to do the same thing when we vote on the motion of non-confidence in this Prime Minister.

For the Bloc to want to save this costly, centralizing Prime Minister and keep him in power even though he constantly encroaches on provincial jurisdictions, they must be truly desperate or completely indifferent to the fate of Quebecers. The Liberals are going to put 1,400 jobs at risk with the Liberal woodland caribou order, and the Bloc Québécois has not even managed to negotiate the order's removal. The only party working to save the forestry sector is the Conservative Party. The Bloc is the worst negotiator in history, and it is ready to sell its soul instead of offering Quebecers the country they deserve.

Will the Bloc Québécois vote to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime?

* * *

[English]

GENWELL

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the important work of Genwell, a grassroots movement tackling one of today's biggest challenges, which is loneliness.

As social beings, we thrive on human connection. In a world where much of our interaction has moved online, in-person connections are more crucial than ever. Genwell's efforts highlight the alarming reality that 50% of Canadians report feeling lonely. The

World Health Organization even recognizes loneliness as a global public health concern, with impacts as harmful as smoking.

I commend Genwell for its work. I invite everyone to join tonight's non-partisan event to support its mission of fostering human connection. I hope to see all members there.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Under the Liberal government, repeat violent offenders are getting bail and parole; justice for victims is being ignored. In fact, 256 people were killed in 2022 by criminals out on bail or another form of release. These 256 people could still be alive today if not for the broken Liberal bail system. Just last month, a serial rapist was granted day parole only four years after he was convicted of sexually assaulting five women while working as a nightclub promoter. Is it any wonder that sexual assaults are up 75% over the past nine years? However, the NDP continues to prop up the Liberals and their soft-on-crime agenda. The Liberal government continues to enable putting criminals before victims.

However, today, members can do the right thing and vote non-confidence in the Liberal government. Only a Conservative government would deliver justice for Canadians and bring home safe streets.

* * *

LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Canadians want an election to decide the direction of this country and the future of the carbon tax. It seems that the NDP leader's pension is worth more to him than the hundreds of thousands of jobs that would be lost because of the quadrupling of the carbon tax. Even the radical NDP premier from B.C. has flip-flopped on the carbon tax, but the leader of the federal NDP has not. He would rather be frenemies with the Prime Minister. Meanwhile, Canadians line up at food banks.

Statements by Members

The NDP can pull out of its costly coalition with the Prime Minister, vote in favour of our non-confidence motion and trigger a carbon tax election. Today, on behalf of all Canadians, there is a chance to bring down the costly government. Will the NDP leader have the guts to give Canadians the election they deserve?

* * *

SOUTHLAKE SENIORS CLUB

Mr. Shafqat Ali (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was excited to welcome 56 members of the Southlake Seniors Club from Brampton; they are visiting Ottawa to attend question period today.

Southlake Seniors Club is a non-profit organization serving seniors in Brampton. Its aim is to stimulate thinking and encourage interest and participation in healthy activities. The club holds regular gatherings, providing opportunities to socialize and participate in cultural and physical activities. The club also organizes health-related seminars and yoga sessions, as well as bus tours, such as today's visit. We thank Southlake Seniors Club for making a difference in our community. I would also like to thank all the hard-working parliamentary staff who have been so helpful in accommodating this visit.

* * *

● (1420)

GUARANTEED LIVABLE BASIC INCOME

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, members of Parliament will vote on Bill C-223 for a guaranteed livable basic income in Canada. While the affordability crisis is hurting all people, those who depend on a deteriorating social safety net are hit the hardest. That includes women and gender-diverse people fleeing violence, who may be stuck in abuse because they lack the financial resources to leave. The reason for call for justice 4.5 of the National Inquiry into Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls is the need to put in place a guaranteed livable basic income, which is something that every single member of Parliament in the House committed to implement.

There are also senior women who do not have pensions because they spent their lives caring for families; many of them live in poverty. In addition, many people in the disability community are subjected to legislated poverty because of insufficient programs, such as the Canada disability benefit.

MPs need to ensure that our constituents' charter rights are upheld by providing them with a level of financial support. I urge all my colleagues to do this by voting in favour of the bill and stop—

[Translation]

The Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member.

The hon. member for Salaberry—Suroît.

* * *

RÉJEAN PARENT

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on July 17, Quebec lost a great unionist, feminist, sovereignist, and progressive with the passing of Réjean Parent.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I would like to offer his loved ones my condolences, starting with his wife Pauline and their children Marie-Hélène, Claudia, and Olivier.

As a unionist, Réjean Parent served the cause of education, which led him from the Syndicat de Champlain to the presidency of the Centrale des syndicats du Québec, a position he held from 2003 to 2012. As a feminist, he was an ally to women determined to take their rightful place, some of whom are sitting here in this very chamber today. As a progressive and sovereignist, he joined every battle to bring about a Quebec nation founded on social justice.

Just last June 25, he ended his column by saying, “Now that the time for making choices has come, I choose a French Quebec as my nation... Vive le Québec libre!”

We in the Bloc Québécois thank Réjean Parent from the bottom of our hearts.

* * *

*[English]***LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA**

Mr. Jake Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of NDP-Liberal-imposed misery, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up. Two years ago, the NDP leader sold workers out. He signed on to a costly coalition with the Liberal Prime Minister, which hiked taxes, made food costs balloon, doubled housing costs and unleashed crime and chaos in our streets. The sellout NDP leader voted to quadruple the carbon tax, a plan that will grind our—

The Speaker: I am going to invite the hon. member to start his S. O. 31 again. I know members' statements are important to all members, but I would remind the hon. member to ensure that the language used is not directed to a particular member in a way that would not be parliamentary.

The hon. member for Miramichi—Grand Lake has the floor.

Mr. Jake Stewart: Mr. Speaker, after nine years of NDP-Liberal-imposed misery, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up. Two years ago, the NDP leader sold workers out. He signed on to a costly coalition with the Liberal Prime Minister, which hiked taxes, made food costs balloon, doubled housing costs and unleashed crime and chaos in our streets. The sellout NDP leader voted to quadruple the carbon tax—

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member to continue his statement following that. If he could just start at another paragraph, I will offer him time to finish his statement.

• (1425)

Mr. Jake Stewart: Mr. Speaker, Canadians need a carbon tax election now to decide between the costly NDP-Liberal coalition and common-sense Conservatives, who will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. It is time for the NDP leader to support our non-confidence motion today or admit that he sold out, threw in the towel and caved once again.

The Speaker: I want to make sure all members understand that it is important for us to be judicious in our use of words, especially in regard to each one who serves here. It is important. We may have our disagreements, but regarding a specific person, we need to be very judicious in our comments because we are all colleagues.

The hon. member from Ottawa West—Nepean has the floor.

* * *

WORLD ALZHEIMER'S MONTH

Ms. Anita Vandenbeld (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I am wearing a forget-me-not pin to recognize World Alzheimer's Month and to stand with the more than 700,000 Canadians living with dementia, a number projected to rise to 1.7 million by 2050.

Dementia costs Canadians over \$10 billion annually, but the personal toll on individuals and their families is immeasurable. In 2017, the House unanimously supported the national dementia strategy, and it remains vital that we continue to work to address this growing challenge.

I want to thank the Alzheimer Society of Canada for the essential work they do in helping families in our communities and funding research for a cure. I am joined today by colleagues from all parties wearing forget-me-not pins. I wear mine for my oma.

Together, we can work toward a future where Alzheimer's and dementia are diseases of the past.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is voting in favour of keeping the most centralizing and costly government in the history of Canada in power. This government is bad for Quebec. It has hired an additional 100,000 public servants. It has doubled its exorbitant spending on consultants. It has doubled the debt and the cost of housing.

Is it not time to let Quebeckers vote to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime with a common-sense government?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is offering cuts to programs, services and the fight against climate change. These are all things that Quebeckers and all Canadians are concerned about.

The Conservatives have nothing to offer but austerity, along with theatrics here in the House of Commons. They will continue to

Oral Questions

push for cuts to programs like dental care and child care, as well as to investments in pharmacare and in the green economy.

We are here to invest in Canadians and Quebeckers. The Conservatives are here to make cuts.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the lowest-income Canadians are already making cuts and living under austerity. This is what a single mother wrote in *Le Devoir*: "I still do not have enough money to buy a home and I feel like that dream is getting further and further away from me, because the crisis keeps getting worse, home prices keep going up and everything is becoming very expensive."

When I was the minister responsible for housing, it cost \$700 a month to rent an apartment in Montreal.

Is it not time to allow Quebeckers to elect a government that will build housing?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Conservative leader were truly concerned about that single mother, he would not have voted against more child care spaces. He would not have voted against help for children with the Canada child benefit. He would not have voted against the investments we are making to create more economic growth for her children, to put more money in her pockets.

When he was the minister responsible for housing under Harper, he did nothing for affordable housing from one end of this country to another. We do not want a repeat of that.

* * *

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, taxes are up, costs are up, crime is up and time is up.

Today, we will vote to trigger a carbon tax election between the costly carbon tax coalition of NDP-Liberals, who tax our food, punish our work, double our housing costs and unleash crime and chaos, and common-sense Conservatives who will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Why can we not bring it home today?

Oral Questions

• (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, this is a clever little performance, with slogans the member has memorized but without any actual solutions for Canadians.

The Leader of the Opposition does not care about Canadians; he cares about his own political self-interest. If he cared about Canadians, he would not have voted against dental care, he would not have voted against more spaces at \$10-a-day child care and he would not have voted against initiatives that are growing the economy and putting more money in people's pockets.

He wants a climate change election. Let us have that election at the right time, where we are putting more money in the pockets of Canadians. This is not the time for that. We are going to continue to deliver for Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, the Prime Minister just said that he wants a carbon tax election on his plan to quadruple the tax to 61¢ a litre. If so, will he call it today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that later on today we will see that the House does not have confidence in the leader of the Conservative Party.

We have delivered and are continuing to deliver reduced emissions, more money in the pockets of Canadians and success in the fight against climate change as we create jobs and build a stronger future. We are focused on delivering for Canadians the things that actually matter, while he is focused on slogans and clapping. We are going to focus on being there for Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is concerned about our clapping for him. He agreed to a carbon tax election on his quadrupling of the tax to 61¢ a litre, where Canadians will choose between an NDP-Liberal government that has taxed their food, punished their work, doubled their housing costs, and unleashed crime and chaos in their communities, or a common-sense Conservative government to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

He is bragging that he has more politicians on his side. Is it not really the case that in Canada the people decide?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the Canada carbon rebate, the price on pollution puts more money in the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadians right across the country. However, we already know from his misunderstanding of carbon pricing that the Conservative leader does not understand math or economics.

What is increasingly clear is that he does not understand science as well. That is why I would be happy to give him a briefing on the science of climate change. There is good news on this one: It does not require a security clearance for it.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois made a reasonable proposal in good

faith on subjects that already have the support of all parties in the House.

I would like the Prime Minister to tell me whether he will give us his word that he will quickly consider the Bloc Québécois's proposal to help seniors and farmers.

• (1435)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, have already repeatedly demonstrated that our priorities include help for seniors and protecting supply management. We have shown that and will continue to do so.

We are very open to continuing to work with other members of the House to respond to the expectations of seniors and farmers.

We know that there are concerns that we can work on together, and we will do that because we are always there to help Quebecers and all Canadians in these difficult times.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is indeed a very good opportunity to help seniors, whose purchasing power he himself reduced, as well as farmers, not only in Quebec but also in Canada. Good for them.

To be more specific, beyond the vague intentions, will the Prime Minister also start reaching out to his casual partners in the NDP to ensure that these bills actually get passed on time?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will of course look at these bills and debate them.

If we want to be more specific, I could point out that a number of seniors I spoke to in Quebec and across the country this summer told me that they had saved hundreds of dollars when they went to the dentist and were covered under the Canadian dental care program. Unfortunately, they do not understand why the Bloc Québécois does not support this care for seniors in Quebec, which has saved them hundreds of dollars.

We will always be there to try to help seniors save money.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, privatizing health care means telling people to either pay up or go to the back of the line. Danielle Smith is privatizing health care in Alberta right now, and the Prime Minister is doing nothing about it. Doug Ford is privatizing health care in Ontario, and the Prime Minister praises him.

Why is the weak Prime Minister letting Conservatives tear down our health care system?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we have always defended universal health care, and we will continue to do so, but the member opposite has a point. In those provinces, the NDP was unable to stop Conservatives from getting elected and weakening universal health care in all those places. That is why we are going to continue to stand up for universal health care, to stand up for progressive values and, indeed, to stand up to Conservatives.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has the power to stop them, but is too weak to do it.

[Translation]

The Conservatives want to make cuts to health care. When the Conservative leader and Stephen Harper were in power, they made almost \$44 billion in cuts. The Conservatives want to privatize health care, just like Doug Ford and Danielle Smith.

Why is the Prime Minister letting them get away with it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well that we are always going to defend our public health care system. We are here to invest so that Canadians have better access to family doctors. We are here to ensure that there are more mental health services. We are here to demand more transparency and accountability from the provinces when it comes to the record amounts the federal government is sending to the provinces.

We will always stand up to Conservative provinces that want to make cuts to our health care.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, actually it is the Prime Minister who is cutting health care. His carbon tax will cost hospitals across this country in heat, in laundry services and in delivering medical equipment. Calculations by the Saskatchewan government show that the carbon tax will cost \$175 million, equal to the loss of 1,900 nurses, all to pay the Prime Minister's greedy, quadrupling carbon tax.

Why will the Prime Minister not get his hands out of the pockets of the provinces and allow the premiers to fund health care?

● (1440)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada carbon rebate puts more money in the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadian families right across the country while it fights climate change and while it creates growth. Fighting climate change is about building a better future for Canadians. This summer alone, insurers are estimating that \$7.7 billion in losses are being covered for that. That is something we have to step up on right now.

The Conservative leader, who does not even believe climate change is real, wants to do absolutely nothing about it. That is not good for Canadians. That is not good for our economy.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hospitals do not get the Canada carbon rebate. A measly

little cheque would not replace the \$175 million that Saskatchewan hospitals are going to lose to heat their buildings, to power their machinery and to deliver their goods, and yet that is what the Prime Minister imposes. There are 1,900 nurses who could lose their jobs in one province alone because of his greedy carbon tax quadrupling.

Why will the Prime Minister not accept the Conservatives' common-sense plan to axe the tax and boost funds for health care?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will note that the Leader of the Opposition voted against our plan to increase funding on health care to \$200 billion over the next 10 years because he wants a two-tier system, like most Conservative premiers in this country. The fact is that climate change will cost everyone in health outcomes, in growth outcomes, in harm to our economy and in harm to our future. He has no plan to fight climate change.

Our plan not only fights climate change but also makes emissions lower, puts more growth on the books and puts more money in the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadians, the middle class and those working hard to join it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is more disinformation from a flailing and desperate Prime Minister clinging to power.

I voted in this Parliament to increase health funding, and in the previous government voted to increase it by 70%, more than the Prime Minister's government has.

More than that, Conservatives did not impose a carbon tax on hospitals. He claims that people are going to get cheques, but 1,900 nurses could lose their jobs because of the carbon tax in one province alone. A phony rebate cheque will not make the difference. Now he wants to quadruple the tax to 61¢ litre.

How many nurses are going to lose their job while hospitals are stuck paying the quadrupling tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition refers to the Canada carbon rebate as a phony cheque. At least he recognizes that it exists, which is new from just a few months ago.

Oral Questions

The Canada carbon rebate, as investigated by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, puts more money, hundreds of dollars, back in the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadians, the middle class and those working hard to join it, who need support, while we fight climate change, while we reduce emissions and while we grow a stronger economy with good jobs for future generations. He has no plan for the economy and no plan for the future.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my common-sense plan is to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Let us talk about education. The carbon tax will cost Saskatchewan schools \$204 million. That is the equivalent of approximately 2,000 teachers losing their job, all to pay tax to heat schools in cold Saskatchewan winters.

Why is the Prime Minister forcing provinces to cut teachers and education to pay for his greedy quadrupling carbon tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there he goes once again with his little performances, the little rhymes and slogans. The reality facing Canadians right across the country, including in Saskatchewan, is wildfires, droughts and floods, issues that are being increased because of the impacts of climate change.

If we do not continue to take ambitious action, future generations will pay dearly for inaction by governments like the government in Saskatchewan that he wants to emulate. The reality is that we put more money in people's pockets while fighting climate change, and we are going to keep doing that.

• (1445)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, screaming and hollering will not distract from the very serious question I asked.

Can the Prime Minister tell us how many nurses and how many teachers will lose their job because his greedy carbon tax quadrupling will drive up costs to heat schools and hospitals?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, teachers and nurses across the country are terrified of Conservative policies that cut programs, cut services and cut supports for the most vulnerable and for those who work hard to care for other Canadians.

Whether it is his opposition to pharmacare, which would be delivering free insulin and free prescription contraceptives, or to investing in a school food program that will help 400,000 kids with more food right across the country, the Conservative leader has opposed the things that nurses and teachers care most about. Let us not take any lessons from him.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister goes from screaming and waving his arms erratically when I mention the carbon tax to bragging about a program that does not even exist. His multi-million dollar school food program has not served a single ham sandwich or a single little bowl of Kraft Dinner, not one meal to one child. It exists to feed bureaucracy in Ottawa, not kids in schools.

Once again, he should put aside the grand dramatic performances and answer the question. How many doctors, nurses and teachers will lose their job because of the quadrupling carbon tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be instructive to look at how many doctors and teachers have lost their jobs because of Conservative governments over the past number of decades. That is exactly what the Conservative leader is proposing once again. I once had a job as a teacher, and I was proud of serving kids every day. I have not just been in the House for 20 years like the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, yes, I was proud to be a schoolteacher, because it was a way of having a positive impact on the lives of thousands of kids over the course of my career. I am proud to bring their voices into this House and continue to put forward how we support our kids and how we support the vulnerable, as opposed to the cuts the Conservatives propose.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is not a race, but let us talk a bit about the numbers. The Bloc Québécois's proposal, its request to adjust the numbers for seniors, amounts to about \$80 a month, or roughly \$1,000 a year, for each year. That is not a one-time treatment. It is not interference in Quebec's exclusive jurisdictions. Dental care should be Quebec's responsibility. Federal pensions are Ottawa's responsibility.

If the Prime Minister respects the jurisdiction of the National Assembly of Quebec, we will talk. If not, we will get ready to head out in our buses and talk to everyone.

What does he choose?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, we have invested heavily in helping seniors. We will continue to look at ways to help them. I think we can all agree that certain vulnerable people need even more help. That is why we are putting a dental care program in place.

As I told my provincial colleagues and partners, if they want to offer the same program at the same cost, we would be more than happy to discuss it with them.

For now, however, we are there to meet our commitments to vulnerable people and seniors. This program has delivered dental care to some 750,000 people across the country.

* * *

• (1450)

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, one does not preclude the other.

The two bills we are talking about, both introduced by the Bloc Québécois, are quite far along in the process. All parties in the House have supported them at various stages. The government was given plenty of time, and this should, in theory, even get the social democrats in the NDP on board.

Does the Prime Minister realize that the clock is ticking? Will he actually start delivering results for seniors and farmers?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are here to deliver for seniors. We have done so and will continue to do so.

With regard to farmers, I made a promise that no new negotiations or any negotiations for free trade agreements would infringe on or take anything away from our supply-managed sectors.

We are here to protect our farmers. I have made this firm commitment, and we will always fulfill that commitment. We will continue to work together to protect farmers and supply management and, yes, to support our seniors.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 2014, New York Times headline reads, “Life in Canada, Home of the World’s Most Affluent Middle Class”. My, how things have changed after nine years of NDP-Liberals. The economy today per capita is actually smaller than it was 10 years ago. Per capita income in Canada has dropped more than in any other G7 country since the year before COVID. The gap between U.S. GDP per capita and Canadian is now 50%, the biggest gap in 100 years.

Will the Prime Minister recognize that taxing, punishing and attacking our businesses is losing us jobs?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition refuses to accept is that cuts to services and programs that Canadians are relying on is not going to grow the economy, is not going to help anyone through. We have the strongest balance sheet in the G7 right now, the lowest deficit, the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio. Companies from around the world are investing in Canada because they believe in Canadians. We are wanting to set that strong fiscal position in service of Canadians who are hurting right now. We want to invest more in dental, more in supports, more in growth and jobs, and he wants to cut at this particular time.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, Canada has the worst mortgage debt, the worst housing inflation in the G7, and now the worst GDP per capita change since the Great Depression and the worst by far in the G7. Those devastating statistics result in very real human costs. That is the reason we have 1,400 homeless encampments in one province alone and two million people lined up at food banks.

Will he not realize that doubling housing costs and taxing people's food has very real human costs?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when that individual was Harper's failed housing minister, he built only six affordable homes across the entire country. He did not help with the investments Canadians needed. His so-called housing plan that he talks about now, which is, again, more performance than substance, lots of slogans, no actual solutions, is not going to deliver for Canadians either. We are doing what he did not do, which is work with housing advocates, work with municipalities, work with provinces and deliver the homes Canadians need.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I was housing minister, rent and mortgage payments were half of what they are now, and there were almost 200,000 of those affordable homes built right across Canada. Now, the Prime Minister wants to bring in a massive tax on home builders with hikes to capital gains. The most pre-eminent economist in Canada, Jack Mintz, reveals that would cost our economy 400,000 jobs and \$90 billion.

Where are those 400,000 unemployed Canadians going to be able to get the money to pay their mortgages?

• (1455)

The Speaker: Before the right hon. Prime Minister takes the floor, I would like to remind all members to please not take the floor when they are not recognized by the Chair.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is instrumentalizing Canadians who are suffering right now to try to score cheap political points. What he is not offering is any sort of solution for Canadians.

We put forward the most ambitious housing plan in decades because we know that working with municipalities, with provinces and with non-profit agencies and charitable foundations is a way of delivering homes. I was just in Vancouver speaking to a young student who got into an apartment because of partnerships this government set up. These are things that make a real difference in people's lives, but he does not care.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will comment on one spectacular social housing project of his and that is the brand-new, lavish apartment he bought his friend the new consul general to New York. It cost \$9 million for his friend Tom Clark to have a “stunning powder room...finished in jewel onyx”, “Cristallo Gold quartzite countertops”, a handcrafted “copper soaking tub”, “custom bronze [bathroom] fixtures” and a \$5,000 coffee machine.

Did the Prime Minister go and inspect this palace in the sky on his recent trip to New York?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, engaging with international leaders on fighting climate change, on solving global crises, on standing up unequivocally for Ukraine—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: Does he engage with them in the bathtub?

An hon. member: Did Tom get the top bunk?

The Speaker: Colleagues, just as I said earlier, I would ask all members to please not take the floor unless they are recognized by the Speaker so we can hear the questions and we can hear the answers.

The right hon. Prime Minister, from the top, please.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, do not worry. On this side of the House, we are used to casual homophobic comments from the other side of the House. What is it about the—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, I heard comments, but because they were not on microphone, I chose not to get up. I would ask, nonetheless, that we all treat each other with the presumption of honour and respect. I will ask the Prime Minister to please withdraw that comment and to start his comment again.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, I heard a comment, as I said, which I could not stand up on because I did not know who said it. However, I do not appreciate when we would tar entire members with that concern. I will ask the hon. member to please withdraw that comment and start his response again, and let us presume the better natures of all members of Parliament here.

The right hon. Prime Minister, from the top.

• (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, standing up to bullies requires us to call them out on their crap sometimes, and that is what I will do.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I will invite the Prime Minister once again to rise on his feet.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I will happily withdraw my comment if the member who suggested that I was sharing a bathtub with Tom Clark stands up and takes responsibility for his—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: As I have indicated to all colleagues here, I was not able to hear or track the source of that statement. I am just asking the Prime Minister to be the better person and to please withdraw his comment and start his response again.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment about defecating; I know the word “crap” is unparliamentary. However, when someone says something that is clearly homophobic, and I am not accusing them of homophobia, but I am saying they made a homophobic—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I appreciate the Prime Minister withdrawing his comment, and the Chair accepts him withdrawing that comment.

However, as the Speaker had indicated, sometimes in this chair, and as those who have occupied this chair or who will occupy this chair will understand, it is a very difficult decision day to day. I heard a comment, I did not know who said it, and the Speaker chose, for the reputation of this House, for us to move on from that comment. I asked the Prime Minister to withdraw his comment, and I appreciate him withdrawing his comment.

The Prime Minister can please respond to the question that was asked earlier.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I know the very idea of standing up for Canada's rights and values on the world stage makes the Leader of the Opposition's skin crawl.

What is it exactly? Is it standing up to fight climate change? Is it standing up for women's rights? Is it standing up for democracy rights and freedom of the press? Whatever it is, he sure does not like it when Canada stands proudly on the world stage because he wants everyone to think that Canada is broken.

Well, Canada is not broken. Canada is the best country in the world, and we can make it even better.

* * *

• (1505)

HEALTH

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, Nunavummiut are prevented from thriving because of the lack of doctors and the lack of access to health care. The Conservative leader wants to cut health care, but Conservatives would have nothing to cut as the Liberals have not invested enough in Nunavut. The Prime Minister has failed on his promises to deliver the health care people need.

When will the Prime Minister invest in the health care Nunavummiut need so that they can thrive?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we signed a historic health agreement with the Premier of Nunavut, and we will continue to be there as health care is delivered across the territory. We know how important it is to continue to invest in health care for the north.

We know how important it is to continue to defend public health care in this country. We will continue to do that even though, as the member opposite rightly points out, Conservatives want to cut public health care. They want to kill public health care.

* * *

SENIORS

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to help our seniors age with dignity. Instead of putting people first, it has protected the profits of companies and abandoned seniors. It has let Doug Ford tear Ontario families apart and force seniors into some of the worst private long-term care homes. The military even found that some of these corporations, including one that the Conservative MP for Thornhill lobbied for, were not giving seniors food and water.

Why will the Prime Minister not put our families and our loved ones before profits?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the concern the member opposite has expressed on security and safety for our most vulnerable seniors. That is why, in the House, we are moving forward with the safe long-term care act later this fall.

We certainly are counting on the support of our progressive friends in the NDP, but we hope that all members in the House will stand up and support a safe long-term care act because we need to make sure we are protecting and supporting our most vulnerable seniors right across the country.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation approaches, Yukoners in my riding and Canadians everywhere will be reflecting on the painful history of first nation, Inuit and Métis children being removed from their families and communities, some of them never to return home. For generations, indigenous peoples were stripped of their cultures and languages. Canada must continue to address the truth and support their healing.

Could the Prime Minister inform the House on the government's efforts to rebuild relationships with indigenous communities and to demonstrate that every child matters?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Yukon for his deep commitment to reconciliation. On September 30th, we reflect on a dark chapter in Canada's history, one of residential schools and colonialism. We reflect on the ongoing impacts for survivors, their families and their communities. We are delivering on the calls to action and reconciliation by moving forward on UNDRIP, and we established the national council for reconciliation.

Indigenous leaders and survivors are guiding our approach. We continue the journey to reconciliation. We will not go back.

Oral Questions

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that the way he stands up for Canada is by buying a \$9-million mansion in the sky for his crony Tom Clark. He goes on a Broadway late-night show and says that it is a small issue that the Americans have illegally taken \$9 billion of our softwood money and cost tens of thousands of jobs.

The Conservatives got a deal on this 80 days after taking office. He has had nine years and three presidents. Why does he keep letting the Americans walk all over him?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was glad to have the chance to speak directly to millions of Americans in this crucial moment and make the argument directly to them that we have been making to policy-makers, which is that U.S. tariffs on Canadian softwood lumber hurt American citizens and consumers.

When I go on American television, I make sure to talk up Canada. Unlike the member for Calgary Nose Hill, who talked down Canada to Tucker Carlson, and unlike the member for Thornhill, who went on Fox News to talk down Canada, I will always proudly stand up for Canada.

● (1510)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not stand up. He backed down. He has been backing down for nine years, during which time three presidents have imposed illegal tariffs, which Conservatives had originally got taken off, and recently, Biden doubled those tariffs, causing 500 mill workers in British Columbia to lose their jobs. They must have been watching that show, seeing the Prime Minister say that their unemployment, and their now poverty, was a “small issue”.

Why does the Prime Minister think he is such a big shot that the jobs of working people are a small issue?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition really did not like that I went down to New York City to talk directly to Americans. Perhaps he would have been happier if I had accepted an all-expenses-paid trip, perhaps down to Florida, to appear at an anti-abortion church. I know he would have been all right with that because that is what he allows of his own members.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, falsehoods will not change the reality. The Prime Minister's record is this: Common-sense Conservatives got a softwood deal that reimbursed \$4 billion in tariffs the Americans had collected within 80 days of taking office last time. Those tariffs were slapped back on under the Prime Minister, and he has capitulated ever since, not collecting one dollar of the tariffs back. In fact, President Biden has now doubled those tariffs. The Prime Minister capitulated on buy America, capitulated on softwood and capitulated on the Keystone pipeline.

Oral Questions

When can we have a government that stops capitulating and starts standing up for Canada?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the deepest of ironies that, during the existential renegotiations of NAFTA, it was the Conservative Party's position that we needed to capitulate to the United States and to Donald Trump. That is not what we did. We stood firm. We protected steelworkers. We protected auto workers. We protected agricultural workers and dairy farmers.

We continue to stand up to Americans while we protect jobs in this country. While they were saying, "It's too important. You need to give in to the United States", we did not. We stood strong. We came out of that with a win-win right across the board.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he capitulated. He signed an agreement that keeps softwood lumber tariffs in place, the very tariffs that the Conservatives had managed to get rid of. He capitulated in deference to Buy America, which discriminates against our construction companies.

He capitulated on the Keystone XL pipeline, and Canada now has \$400 billion more invested in the United States than the U.S. does in Canada. Why is he capitulating when our construction and forestry workers' jobs are on the line?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, he should be very careful not to remind people what life was like during the Stephen Harper years, when he was in government. Canadians remember all too well how much they suffered under a government that was not there to invest in people, that made cuts to services, to the armed forces, to police, to child care, to every program that Canadians were relying on. That government also failed to create the necessary growth to help Canadians.

We will continue to invest in Canadians. We will continue to stand up for our steel and aluminum workers. We will be there to defend jobs in Canada.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to imagine how the government could possibly fail to get this done, given that everyone has already agreed to the Bloc's bills. I imagine everyone will remain in agreement. The NDP agrees. The Conservatives agree. The Liberals have agreed.

I want to know whether the Prime Minister is going to get moving, because time is running out. For the sake of seniors and farmers, especially those in Quebec, I am willing to speak with any leader of any party. To get this done by October 29, we need to get moving. Does he agree?

● (1515)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to know that the Bloc Québécois might be there to support our dental care program for seniors, because this program has helped so many seniors. Three-quarters of a million Canadians, including Quebeckers, have accessed dental care. The Bloc

Québécois was against this program, but we implemented it anyway, and now we are providing this care to millions of people.

We will continue to be there to help seniors with dental care. We will continue to be there to invest in their future with housing. We are going to continue to be there to provide the services they need.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of messaging that has left the Liberal government teetering on the brink. The Liberals should try to change their approach a bit. Maybe they could dispense with the grandstanding and try to have more substance and content.

The Prime Minister himself said that he agrees with helping seniors. He voted for that. He also agrees with supply management. He also voted for that. Everyone agrees. He needs to put his money where his mouth is. We absolutely need two bills.

Are we moving forward or not?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is always moving forward, whether it is with investments for seniors, investments in jobs for future generations, or the fight against climate change, in parallel with economic growth.

We are here to continue to work constructively with all those in the House who want to deliver results for Canadians.

I am very happy to be able to continue our constructive and productive conversations with the Bloc Québécois.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, at the same time he was proposing to quadruple the carbon tax to 61¢ a litre for seniors, small businesses and single moms, the Prime Minister spent his summer in a frenzy of high-carbon, high-taxing and high-flying hypocrisy. Newly released data shows that he went 92,000 kilometres. In flights, on average, every two days, he went through 300,000 litres of jet fuel.

Why is it that the Prime Minister punishes working-class Canadians with his quadrupling carbon tax, when he flies around burning more and more jet fuel?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the Leader of the Opposition had actually met with Canadians, talked with media or been out there across the country over the course of the summer, he would have heard that Canadians need the support of government programs and services.

Oral Questions

Canadians want to see \$10-a-day child care. Canadians want to see support on dental care. Canadians want to see a national school food program. These are all things that the Leader of the Opposition wants to cut because that is all he is offering Canadians. That shows me he was not listening to the Canadians he was talking to. He was just making sure he could use them to advance his own political aims. We are offering solutions.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there we have it. The Prime Minister was charging Canadians for his 92,000 kilometres of flights so that he could go around repeating the promises that he has broken nationwide while taxing them. His plan is to hike that tax to 61¢ a litre. The Prime Minister emitted more carbon than 114 Canadians combined this summer.

Why does the Prime Minister drive people into poverty and children into hunger with promises he breaks and hypocrisy that he cannot reconcile?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, now Canadians know. In the unfortunate event that that guy ever ends up Prime Minister, he would stay at home in his basement on YouTube the whole time, instead of meeting with Canadians.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we can resolve that question right now with a carbon tax election.

[*Translation*]

However, we know that the Prime Minister does not want an election because his record on the environment is just as bad as his record on the economy. It is not just tax hikes. Canada now ranks 63rd out of 67 countries for effective environmental measures. Hypocrisy does nothing for the environment.

Is he not ready to defend that disastrous record before Canadians?

• (1520)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are beginning to understand that the leader of the Conservative Party has no plan to fight climate change, no plan to put more money in Canadians' pockets by fighting climate change. He does not understand that the only way to create a strong economy for the future is by protecting the environment and fighting climate change.

The Conservative leader's ideological refusal to understand the importance of continuing the fight against climate change proves that he is completely out of touch with Quebeckers and all Canadians.

* * *

WOMEN AND GENDER EQUALITY

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has clearly indicated that a woman's right to choose is a fundamental right.

Eight out of 10 Canadians say that they support access to abortion, and many of them are rightfully concerned that the Conservative leader and his party will not protect this fundamental right.

Does the Prime Minister agree that a party that does not vigorously and tirelessly defend a woman's right to choose cannot say that it is pro-choice?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for London West for that very important question.

Canadian women are very concerned when they see the Conservative member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands going on an all-expenses-paid trip to Florida to promote a future where women do not have access to abortion. They are right to be concerned about the fact that the Conservative member for Yorkton—Melville has introduced a bill to limit access to abortion, not once, not twice, but three times, and the Leader of the Opposition voted in favour of that bill.

The Leader of the Opposition can pretend about a lot of things, but he cannot pretend to be pro-choice.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have already stated that we are not going to change the abortion law, and everything he said is completely false.

In fact, we are going to protect women with laws against violence. Violence has increased by 53% after nine years under this Prime Minister because of policies that free the worst and most violent repeat offenders. The Bloc Québécois has supported those policies.

Will the Prime Minister give Quebeckers a chance to vote to stop the crime by putting the real criminals in jail and finally securing our borders?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, women in Canada know very well that being pro-choice means standing up to all those who want to limit women's rights, who want to take away women's rights, as we have seen in the U.S.

However, what we continually see from this Conservative leader is that he is incapable of standing up to members of his own caucus who want to limit women's access to abortion. He even votes in favour of measures that Conservative members are putting forward to restrict access to abortion. It is a disgrace.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everything the Prime Minister just said there is completely false. I could use another word to describe stating a falsehood knowingly, but we will save that for when we are outside the House.

The reality is that after nine years of the Prime Minister's policies, gun crime is up 120%, as he has put all the resources into targeting lawful, law-abiding, trained and tested duck hunters and blown \$67 million without recovering a single, solitary gun that he promised four years ago to ban.

Oral Questions

Why will the Prime Minister not let Canadians vote to stop the crime and put the real gun criminals in jail?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time the Leader of the Opposition gets up on his feet to rhyme off his little show, his party members applaud enthusiastically, but during the two times he just stood up to suggest that he is perhaps pro-choice, there was silence from his team. He cannot protect women's rights from the members of his own caucus. That is not standing up for women. That is not protecting the future. That is not freedom in this country.

• (1525)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, beyond the normal fear and falsehoods, what we are seeing from the Prime Minister today is someone who is erratic and who has lost control of himself because he is so desperate to hold onto power.

My question was about car theft. My next one is about Nanaimo drug dens, which are now funded and authorized by the government through a permit under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. They were cracked down upon by police officers for trafficking illegal substances and having 13 weapons.

Will the Prime Minister stop giving permits for these illegal drug dens so that we can stop the crime and bring home safety?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize that far too many Canadians have been impacted by the opioid epidemic and the toxic drug crisis. That is why we are doubling down on science and supports on the street. We are here to look at ways to help families through this, to deal with addictions, to lift people out of poverty. We will partner with people right across the country to do that on things that make sense in their jurisdictions. We are going to stay grounded in science while the leaders opposite choose their ideology as guiding paths.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Parm Bains (Steveston—Richmond East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, throughout the summer, I met with my constituents and listened to what is on their minds. They want rapid construction of new housing options. They want their kids to have the best possible start in life, with \$10-a-day child care and nutritious food in schools. They want to build an economy that works for everyone. They know that in order to do this, we need to make our tax system fair.

Could the Prime Minister please update the House on the government's plan to create fairness for every generation?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Steveston—Richmond East for his hard work.

This is about fairness for every generation, by building more homes, making life more affordable and creating more good-paying jobs. Today, the House will vote on our plan to make the tax system fairer. We know that fairness is the last thing the Conservative leader and his party care about and that his agenda is filled with cuts to

housing, health care and freedoms. On this side, we stand with Canadians.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Israel's horrifying and indiscriminate bombings of Lebanon continue, and Canada is nowhere to be found. Hundreds of civilians have been killed, including two Canadians and dozens of children. There are tens of thousands of Canadians in Lebanon. Our constituents are terrified of what will come next. Canada must immediately call for de-escalation and take real action to create peace and safety for everyone in the region.

When will the Prime Minister act to save Canadians in Lebanon and their families?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past days, I have spoken with Lebanese Canadians who are deeply worried for their families, and our hearts go out to the loved ones of the two Canadians killed.

We need to see de-escalation right now from both Israel and Hezbollah. I spoke with leaders this week, including the King of Jordan and the UN Secretary-General, along with G7 allies, on the need for urgent de-escalation. Civilians need to be protected. This violence needs to stop. We need to move on a path toward regional stability and peace.

• (1530)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, on the same point, it is clear that world leaders have been calling out over the last year, since the horrific attacks of October 7, for restraint and to control the conflict so that it does not spread, just as it is spreading into Lebanon. We know who the enemy of peace is; unfortunately, he has a name. He is Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. He has put his political career and his—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, I will ask you to only take the floor when you are recognized by the Chair.

I am going to ask the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands to conclude her question. She has 10 seconds on the clock.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, we are allies of Israel, but Israel's prime minister is unpopular. He has put his personal ego and political career ahead of rescuing Israeli hostages, and he seems to care nothing about innocent civilians, whether in—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the violence in the Middle East needs to stop. We need to see hostages released. We need to see Hamas lay down its arms. We need a ceasefire. We need to get back on a path toward a two-state solution where we have a peaceful, secure, democratic Israel alongside a peaceful, secure, democratic Palestinian state.

That is Canada's position. That is what we are working with friends, allies and partners on in the region. That is what we will continue to work on every single day to bring peace and stability to that region.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period, we clearly heard a very derogatory, homophobic and cowardly comment coming from the Conservative benches and directed at the Prime Minister. Clearly Conservative MPs heard it, because many of them started to laugh.

I have listened to the feed on ParlVU and can hear the remark.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to review the tapes and come back with a ruling.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Edmonton Griesbach for his intervention. I will take it under advisement and come back to the House if necessary.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1535)

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CONFIDENCE IN THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE GOVERNMENT

The House resumed from September 24 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3.34 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

● (1545)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 858)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell

d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genius	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmieciak
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	Strahl
Stubbs	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 120

Business of Supply

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel

Private Members' Business

Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pausé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie

Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAtlay (Cardigan)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Qualtrough
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge

Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 211

Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR A GUARANTEED LIVABLE BASIC INCOME ACT

The House resumed from September 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-223, An Act to develop a national framework for a guaranteed livable basic income, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-223 under Private Members' Business.

• (1600)

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

(*Division No. 859*)

YEAS

Members

Angus
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Blaney
 Cannings
 Casey
 Collins (Victoria)
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fisher
 Garrison
 Gerretsen
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Idlout
 Julian
 Long
 MacGregor
 Mathysen
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McPherson
 Morrissey
 Rogers
 Singh

Arya
 Atwin
 Barron
 Boulterice
 Carr
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Desjarlais
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fry
 Gazan
 Green
 Hardie
 Hughes
 Johns
 Kwan
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Masse
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McLeod
 Morrice
 Naqvi
 Rota
 Taylor Roy

Private Members' Business

Zahid	Zarrillo— 54	Larouche	Lattanzio
	NAYS	Lauzon	Lawrence
	Members	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Aboultaif	Aitchison	Lehoux	Lemire
Albas	Alghabra	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Ali	Allison	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Anand	Anandasangaree	Lightbound	Lloyd
Arnold	Arseneault	Lobb	Longfield
Badawey	Bains	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Baker	Baldinelli	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Barlow	Barrett	Majumdar	Maloney
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Beaulieu	Beech	May (Cambridge)	Mazier
Bendayan	Bergeron	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McGuinty
Berthold	Bérubé	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Bezan	Bibeau	McLean	Melillo
Bittle	Blair	Mendès	Mendicino
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Miao	Michaud
Block	Blois	Miller	Moore
Boissonnault	Bradford	Morantz	Morrison
Bragdon	Brassard	Motz	Murray
Brière	Brock	Muys	Nater
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Ng	Normandin
Caputo	Carrie	O'Connell	Oliphant
Chabot	Chagger	O'Regan	Patzer
Chahal	Chambers	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Champagne	Champoux	Perkins	Perron
Chatel	Chen	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Chiang	Chong	Poilievre	Powlowski
Cooper	Cormier	Qualtrough	Rayes
Dalton	Dancho	Redekopp	Reid
Davidson	DeBellefeuille	Rempel Garner	Richards
Deltell	d'Entremont	Roberts	Robillard
Desbiens	Desilets	Romanado	Rood
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Ruff	Sahota
Diab	Doherty	Sajjan	Saks
Dong	Dowdall	Samson	Sarai
Dreeshen	Drouin	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Dubourg	Duclos	Scheer	Schiefke
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Schmale	Seeback
Ellis	Epp	Sgro	Shanahan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Sheehan	Shields
Fast	Ferreri	Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Findlay	Fonseca	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Fortier	Fortin	Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Sorbara	Soroka
Freeland	Gaheer	Sousa	Steinley
Gainey	Gallant	Ste-Marie	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Garon	Gaudreau	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	St-Onge
Généreux	Genuis	Strahl	Stubbs
Gill	Gladu	Sudds	Tassi
Godin	Goodridge	Thériault	Therrien
Gould	Gourde	Thompson	Tochou
Gray	Guilbeault	Tolmie	Trudeau
Hajdu	Hallan	Trudel	Turnbull
Hoback	Holland	Uppal	Valdez
Housefather	Hussen	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Hutchings	Iacono	Van Popta	Vandal
Ien	Jaczek	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Jeneroux	Jivani	Vidal	Vien
Joly	Jones	Viersen	Vignola
Jowhari	Kelloway	Villemure	Virani
Kelly	Khalid	Vis	Vuong
Khanna	Khera	Wagantall	Warkentin
Kitchen	Kmiec	Waugh	Webber
Koutrakis	Kram	Weiler	Wilkinson
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Williams	Williamson
Kusie	Kusmierczyk	Yip	Zimmer
Lake	Lalonde	Zuberi— 273	
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux		
Lantsman	Lapointe		

Private Members' Business

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

**NATIONAL STRATEGY TO REDUCE FOOD WASTE AND
COMBAT FOOD INSECURITY**

The House resumed from September 20 consideration of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 110 under Private Members' Business in the name of the member for Willowdale.

● (1615)

[English]

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

(Division No. 860)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera

Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saamich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thompson	Trudeau
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 177	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
Desbiens	Desilets
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garon

Private Members' Business

Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Michaud	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Therrien
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vignola
Villemure	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 150

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed from September 23 consideration of the motion that Bill C-378, An Act amending the Canada Labour Code (complaints by former employees), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-378 under Private Members' Business.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (1625)

The Deputy Speaker: Before getting the Table to compile the results of the vote, I want to thank our caller for such a great job but also to wish him a very happy birthday: our clerk Robert Benoit. I know I am going to pay for that.

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

(Division No. 861)

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
Desbiens	Desilets
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
Ferreri	Findlay
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gallant	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau

Private Members' Business

Gazan
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Gould
Gray
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jeneroux
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maguire
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod
Melillo
Mendicino
Michaud
Moore
Morrice
Morrisey
Murray
Naqvi
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Patzner
Pauzé
Perron
Plamondon
Powlowski
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Rogers
Rood
Ruff
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay

Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Green
Hajdu
Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jivani
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khanna
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Majumdar
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean
McPherson
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morantz
Morrison
Motz
Muys
Nater
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Petitpas Taylor
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Romanado
Rota
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia

Scheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sorbara
Sousa
Ste-Marie
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Tolmie
Turnbull
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Schiefke
Seeback
Sgro
Sheehan
ShIPLEY
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Soroka
Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
St-Onge
Stubbs
Tassi
Therrien
Tochor
Trudel
Uppal
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vidal
Vierson
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi—326

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

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

* * *

● (1630)

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from September 24 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.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motions at report stage of Bill S-205, under Private Members' Business.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 12.

Private Members' Business

● (1640)

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

(Division No. 862)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Beaulieu	Bendayan
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Glada	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Robillard	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seebach
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	Strahl
Stubbs	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Villemure
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer — 123	

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino

Private Members' Business

Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 202

Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Calkins
Caputo
Carrie
Chabot
Chahal
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper
Coteau
Dalton
Dancho
Davies
Deltell
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dong
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garon
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Green
Hajdu
Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jivani
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khanna
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan

Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Berthold
Bezan
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carr
Casey
Chagger
Chambers
Champoux
Chen
Chong
Collins (Victoria)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davidson
DeBellefeuille
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Doherty
Dowdall
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Gallant
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Gould
Gray
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jeneroux
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 12 defeated.

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

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

• (1655)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 863*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Ali
Anand
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow

Aitchison
Alghabra
Allison
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett

Private Members' Business

Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Majumdar
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean
McPherson
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morantz
Morrison
Murray
Naqvi
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Patzner
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Rogers
Rood
Ruff
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Schieffe
Seeback
Sgro
Sheehan
Shiple
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Soroka
Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
St-Onge
Stubbs
Tassi
Therrien
Tochor
Trudeau
Turnbull
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong

Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maguire
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod
Melillo
Mendicino
Michaud
Moore
Morrice
Morrissey
Muys
Nater
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Plamondon
Powlowski
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Romanado
Rota
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sorbara
Sousa
Ste-Marie
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl
Studds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Tolmie
Trudel
Uppal
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall

Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi— 324

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[English]***Ms. Raquel Dancho** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.**The Speaker:** If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Kildonan—St. Paul.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (1705)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 864)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Berthold
Bezan
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carr
Casey
Chagger
Chambers
Champoux
Chen
Chong
Collins (Victoria)

Aitchison
Alhabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Calkins
Caputo
Carrie
Chabot
Chahal
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper

Private Members' Business

Cormier	Coteau	Mendicino	Miao
Dabrusin	Dalton	Michaud	Miller
Damoff	Dancho	Moore	Morantz
Davidson	Davies	Morrice	Morrison
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Morrissey	Murray
Desbiens	Desilets	Muys	Naqvi
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Nater	Ng
Dhillon	Diab	Noormohamed	O'Connell
Doherty	Dong	Oliphant	O'Regan
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Drouin	Dubourg	Paupé	Perkins
Duclos	Duguid	Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary)	Dzerowicz	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Rayes	Redekopp
Ellis	Epp	Reid	Rempel Garner
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Richards	Roberts
Fast	Ferri	Robillard	Rogers
Fisher	Fonseca	Romanado	Rood
Fortier	Fortin	Rota	Ruff
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Sahota	Sajjan
Freeland	Fry	Saks	Samson
Gaheer	Gainey	Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Gallant	Garon	Scheer	Schiefke
Garrison	Gaudreau	Schmale	Seeback
Gazan	Généreux	Serré	Sgro
Genuis	Gerretsen	Shanahan	Sheehan
Gill	Gladu	Shields	Shiple
Godin	Goodridge	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Gould	Gourde	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Gray	Green	Singh	Small
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Sorbara	Soroka
Hallan	Hanley	Sousa	Steinley
Hardie	Hepfner	Ste-Marie	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Hoback	Holland	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	St-Onge
Housefather	Hughes	Strahl	Stubbs
Hussen	Hutchings	Sudds	Tassi
Iacono	Idlout	Taylor Roy	Therrien
Ien	Jaczek	Thompson	Tochor
Jeneroux	Jivani	Tolmie	Trudeau
Johns	Joly	Trudel	Turnbull
Jones	Jowhari	Uppal	Valdez
Julian	Kayabaga	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Kelloway	Kelly	Van Popta	Vandal
Khalid	Khanna	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Khera	Kitchen	Vidal	Vien
Kmiec	Koutrakis	Viersen	Vignola
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Villemure	Virani
Kurek	Kusie	Vis	Vuong
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Wagantall	Warkentin
Lake	Lalonde	Waugh	Webber
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Weiler	Wilkinson
Lantsman	Lapointe	Williams	Williamson
Larouche	Lattanzio	Yip	Zahid
Lauzon	Lawrence	Zarrillo	Zimmer
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Zuberi— 321	
Lehoux	Lemire		
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)		
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert		
Lightbound	Lloyd		
Lobb	Long	Nil	NAYS
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)		
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)		PAIRED
Maguire	Majumdar	Nil	
Maloney	Martel		
Martinez Ferrada	Masse		
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.	
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier	(Bill read the third time and passed)	
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)	[English]	
McGuinty	McKay		
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean		
McLeod	McPherson		
Melillo	Mendès		

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 90 minutes.

• (1710)

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was here just before you announced the last vote. Unfortunately, I was not recognized, but I understand that the last two votes for which I did vote, both in favour, were not registered. I am wondering if you could clarify that. If they are not registered, then I would ask for your consent to be registered as in favour.

The Speaker: I would like to inform the hon. minister that we have his vote recorded for third reading, but we would need to seek unanimous consent of the House to have his other vote considered.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, I would seek unanimous consent for my vote on Bill S-205 to be registered in favour.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to submit his vote in favour?

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that the volume of earpieces will now be reset. Members using their earpiece at this time will have to readjust the volume.

• (1715)

Hon. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to change my vote, which was incorrectly recorded as nay, to yea on the concurrence of Bill S-205.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 69th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business met to consider the items added to the order of precedence on Friday, June 14, as well as the orders for the second reading of private members' public bills originating in the Senate, and recommended that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

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 Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, Finance; the hon. member for Spadina—Fort York, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Health.

Routine Proceedings

• (1720)

FINANCE

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I move that the 16th report of the Standing Committee on Finance, presented to the House on Monday, February 26, be concurred in.

I will be sharing my time with my amazing colleague, the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

What an honour it is to rise on behalf of my constituents, the great people of Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley. Every day I come here, I think about what we can do as members of Parliament to make their lives just a bit better.

It is also an honour for me to serve as a member of the Standing Committee on Finance, where I have been for the most part since I was elected in 2019, with a brief stint along the way as a member of the foreign affairs committee. The members of the finance committee serve a vital role as the only opposition party focused on holding the Liberal government to account.

People are suffering across this land from coast to coast to coast after nine years of the most incompetent and out-of-touch government in Canadian history. That is why I think it is very important to point out the extraordinary display of hypocrisy we just saw unfold in the chamber.

Just two weeks ago, in the throes of the Elmwood—Transcona by-election, the leader of the NDP rose to his feet in front of the cameras, held up a copy of the coalition agreement and said that he was ripping it up and that he was done with the Prime Minister. He said that it was over and that the gloves were off. I cannot help but think that the New Democrats thought they were going to lose the by-election. They knew the Liberals were dragging them down, and so the leader stood up in front of the cameras and said that he was ripping up the coalition agreement.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There seem to be conversations going on. I am not sure what those conversations are about, but I would ask members to please have them outside the chamber, because they are interrupting the proceedings.

The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, the extraordinary display of hypocrisy that just occurred in the House has never before been seen on a level like that in the history of this country and in the history of this austere chamber.

What happened? The leader of the NDP knew he was going down. We had a great candidate. I was at doors with him many times. Colin Reynolds is a construction electrician, a guy on the executive of his local IBEW union board who grew up in the area and who really connected with the residents.

Routine Proceedings

The leader of the NDP knew he was going to lose the by-election. What did he do? He said that he was ripping up the agreement and that he was done with the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, the people of Elmwood—Transcona deserve better. They deserve better than having the leader of the NDP try to fool them into thinking he is a man of principle. He is not, and that was established today. In front of the entire country, the man who said he was ripping up the agreement got up, taped it back together and said that he believes in the Prime Minister and is voting with him. In fact, he said he has confidence in the Prime Minister.

The height of hypocrisy is on a level never, ever before seen on the floor of the chamber. Canadians will not forget it, and the people of Elmwood—Transcona will not forget it come the next election.

Regarding the issue of the report, as I said, I sit on the committee. Conservatives really are the only members on the committee who are doing their best to hold the government to account. We had some great ideas for the report that our colleagues from other parties on the committee would not support. Therefore, for the people watching, I will explain that we attached a dissenting report to the report, which we are allowed to do. Anyone can look it up online and read the dissenting report. I want to go through some parts of it, but before I do, I want to just circle back for a second to look at part of the Liberal government's record.

In 2015, in order to fool Canadians into voting for him, the Prime Minister promised to balance the budget by 2019. Of course that never happened. In fact he doubled the national debt in nine years. It is hard to get one's head around that, but just to put it in perspective, in 2015, when the Prime Minister first was elected to office, the national debt was \$616 billion. Today it is over \$1.2 trillion. The Prime Minister has gone more in debt than all other prime ministers from 1867 to today combined.

Today the interest on the debt is \$52 billion a year, which is more than we spend on health care, more than we spend on defence and in fact more than we actually collect in the GST. It is important for people watching to know that when they go out and buy something in the store and the store adds on the GST, that money is going directly to paying the interest on the massive, historic debt that the Prime Minister has managed to rack up.

Therefore at committee, Conservatives made a number of common-sense recommendations that were rejected by the NDP and Liberal members. One of the recommendations we made, which we had hoped would be a recommendation in the report, was to axe the carbon tax. The reason we wanted to axe the carbon tax is pretty straightforward, and I will go through some of those points. For example, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Tiff Macklem, came to committee and told us that the carbon taxes are inflationary and that by cutting the carbon tax, inflation would come down by 0.6%, bringing the CPI back into the bank's target range.

The government has an opportunity now to start with the carbon tax on farmers. The common-sense Conservative bill, Bill C-234, should be passed immediately in its original form to take the tax off farmers to help lower food prices. I know it has been said many times in the House, but when one taxes the farmer who produces the food, taxes the trucker who ships the food and taxes the grocer

who stocks the food, the food costs more. What is the result? It is two million Canadians lining up at food banks, and a historic number of homeless encampments across this country.

• (1725)

Earlier this year, as part of the finance committee's housing study, Mayor Cam Guthrie from Guelph was a witness. He was elected in 2014. I asked Mayor Guthrie how many homeless encampments there were in Guelph the year he was elected. He said there were zero. I asked how many there are today, and he said there are 20. That is just one example.

I made a speech about this the other day in the House and went through the litany of housing-hell stories across this country as a result of the apocalyptic, historically terrible housing policies of the Liberal government. With \$82 billion on the national housing strategy, never before has so much been spent to achieve so little.

It is time to axe the failed and inflationary carbon tax that makes gas, groceries and home heating more expensive, and to bring down inflation so Canadians can once again earn powerful paycheques so they can afford nutritious food and a home in a safe neighbourhood. It seems like a simple ask, part of the Canadian dream, but that dream has been broken by the failed policies of the Liberal government.

We said to axe the tax, and we also talked about building more homes. There is a housing crisis in this country. There is an affordability crisis, and we need to build millions of homes. However, the Liberals and the NDP voted against our common-sense Conservative bill, the building homes, not bureaucracy act, a bill that would have gotten houses built. Instead they just got in the way. They are the gatekeepers of the House of Commons, and they got in the way of a common-sense bill that would have helped Canadians. Of course, we also need to fix the budget and stop the crime. Let us bring it home.

• (1730)

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as we are listening, the Conservatives never miss the opportunity to actually work for Canadians. We were supposed to be discussing Bill C-71 tonight, which is about lost Canadians. When the Conservatives were in power, they actually stripped the ability of Canadians to retain or gain their citizenship. I wanted to debate the bill tonight because it would affect my daughter, who was born abroad but has lived here all of her life; it might actually ensure that her children have Canadian citizenship.

Routine Proceedings

I would ask the member this: Why is it that we have to hear the same slogans over and over again rather than do the work we are doing on this side of the House for Canadians?

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, I will agree with the member. At one point she said that Conservatives never cease to work for Canadians. In fact, that is absolutely correct. We will never cease to work for Canadians, and that is exactly what we are doing right now.

I will take no lessons from a member who literally was holding hands with Mahmoud Abbas in Ramallah less than a year ago, after what happened on October 7, 2023.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague for his speech in the House and all the work he does on the Standing Committee on Finance.

We are talking about the prebudget consultation report tabled in February of this year, after which the government tabled its budget.

Does my colleague feel that the budget the government tabled in the spring was well rooted in the consultations we held and the report we presented to the government?

[*English*]

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, as I said, Conservatives tabled a dissenting report, and that report was based on testimony we heard from many witnesses at committee who said that the carbon tax was just a terrible policy that was making life harder for everyone, that we needed to take tangible steps to build more homes, that the budget was out of control, and in fact that the budgetary spending was the actual cause of spiking inflation and making everything more expensive for everyone. We heard testimony saying that we needed to bring in things like mandatory minimum sentences and consecutive sentences in order to help stem the tide of crime in this country.

Those things are in a dissenting report for the very reason my colleague mentioned, which is that our colleagues in the Liberal and NDP parties on the committee would not agree to listen to what the witnesses said.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. Minister for Mental Health and Addictions is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Ya'ara Saks: Madam Speaker, I would like to raise a matter of personal privilege with regard to the member's comments about the government work that I did abroad. I am a Canadian citizen and an Israeli citizen; I have dedicated 30 years of my life to peacebuilding and he took a—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): This is more a point of debate than it is a matter of privilege.

The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, actually, the minister has a point. My colleague simply asked the member a question in relation to what he said on the floor of the House of Commons, and he took the time to insult her. That is totally unacceptable. He should be apologizing to the House.

• (1735)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): This is all part of debate. I want to remind members to be careful on the wording of what they are saying in the House. This has caused a bit of disorder.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague talked about the by-election in Elmwood—Transcona. He talked about small business people. For seven years, the NDP led the charge to cap credit card merchant fees and forced the government to do something. The Conservatives sat silent for seven years while small business people paid some of the highest credit card fees in the world. Leila Dance, who won in Elmwood—Transcona, ran the Transcona business improvement association. The reason she won is that small business people saw right through the Conservatives, who are actually just there for big corporations.

Why were the Conservatives silent and standing up for Visa and Mastercard instead of small business owners in this country?

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, that is pretty rich from this member. His party voted with a government that spiked inflation higher than it has ever been before, quicker than has ever happened before, and this has made everything more expensive. As much as they like to talk about how inflation has come down to the 2% target, the damage has been done. Everything is more expensive. Good on him for taking on credit card interest, but the reality is that the policies he supported were seriously detrimental to affordability in this country. Canadians are suffering now because of that.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure and an honour to rise on behalf of the good people of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, and I am very proud to be sharing this time with the previous member.

The Standing Committee on Finance has a very important job. In fact, it is a rare committee because, in our Standing Orders, it actually says that the finance committee must travel and hear widely from Canadians as it does its deliberations. As we have heard from the leader of Canada's common-sense Conservatives, Canada has a problem. We have a gatekeeper economy, which means that there are many people who are seeking prosperity and opportunity, but they cannot do so because of the various gatekeepers that are closing in. I was previously a member of the finance committee, and we would sometimes travel to remote locations to hear testimony. I took great pride in the effort to do so.

One of the key problems we have is that the average citizen does not have a lobbyist here in Ottawa. Oftentimes, lobbyists are the ones coming to the finance committee, and the number one recommendation they always make is to spend more money. When we talk about the costly coalition of a mainly NDP-Liberal government, sometimes supported by the Bloc, it is because there is never a dollar for which they could not find something to spend it on.

Routine Proceedings

Let us hearken back to the first majority the government had. The President of the Treasury Board at the time said they were going to do a spending review. From the spending review, they found that they needed to spend more money. That is the kind of situation we have: There is no leadership or priority except to spend others' money. When I speak about this issue, I often say of the government that Ottawa has a spending problem; it does not have a revenue problem. Nevertheless, there is not a tax that the government will not look to increase. Every April 1, we see a hodgepodge of different taxes, starting with the carbon tax. It does not matter what province one is from; with the exception of Quebec, we see the NDP-Liberal government raising the carbon tax again every April 1. In fact, if we go to the B.C. NDP government's own budget documents, on page 75, they actually say that the federal government is responsible for having to raise the carbon tax.

I want to take a quick moment to point out that the member for Foothills has asked the government about carbon tax 1 and carbon tax 2. Yes, we have ended up with a series of regulations. Of course, they have been fully costed by both the government and the parliamentary budget office. By the government's own analysis, when each respective tax is combined, it is a tax on the economy of up to, if not higher than, \$40 billion per year.

Let us be mindful that the leader of the NDP has always advocated for more taxes to come to Ottawa. He has talked about not supporting carbon taxes, but we shall see; he also talked about not supporting the Liberal Prime Minister anymore. In fact, he famously tore up the agreement for confidence and supply. He said that the Prime Minister should not be Prime Minister. However, the NDP leader came to this place today, and what did he and his caucus do? They supported the government. It will be really interesting to see what happens next April 1, when we have such things as the carbon tax and excise tax on alcohol set to increase. We will see what happens at that particular juncture.

I am going to go back to the gatekeeping economy, the lobbyists and whatnot. The lobbyists always come and they present something. When I speak to my constituents, they say that they are barely able to keep up with what they have, including affording nutritious food. Sylvain Charlebois, the food professor at Dalhousie, has said that people are making the very difficult choice between food's nutrition and cost, and they are siding more with the cost.

• (1740)

We should be concerned that many of our constituents are going to food banks because they cannot afford to pay their carbon tax, their income tax and all the taxes the government continues to raise. Who speaks for those people? They do not have a lobbyist. We are supposed to speak for them. We are the ones who are ultimately responsible for either giving the government supply or denying it.

We had a confidence vote today where we saw both the Bloc and the NDP side with the Liberal government. I believe we need to be looking more to our constituents rather than the recommendations of lobbyists who show up at the finance committee and others. We also need to consider that the average John Smith or Jane Doe is facing critical shortages of housing, especially if they are younger.

The Liberal government has said during every single fall economic update and every budget that it will address that. It has not.

It has not addressed such things as chronic homelessness or the fact that young people cannot get into the market, even when they save and scrimp to get there. Liberals keep talking about all the different programs they offer and how that is going to alleviate the issues in the system. However, going back to that gatekeeper economy, we have city councillors who are choosing not to build housing in sufficient quantities in many municipalities, particularly in those large urban centres and census metropolitan areas.

Housing demand has only gone up because of the policies of the government. If there is a massive demand for housing and we continue to allow gatekeepers, such as municipal councils, to basically stop the investment of new housing, that is going to create an affordability challenge and a crisis. In B.C., in the past year, we have seen housing starts drop by 34%.

Government members, and politicians who support them, constantly talk about the housing crisis, yet there is very little discussion about putting pressure on municipalities. In fact, the government's own so-called housing accelerator, which I called a slush fund for municipalities, is essentially allowing municipalities to not increase housing stock by writing them cheques. This happens even in part of my riding in Kelowna. The housing accelerator plan talks about how they can actually invest the dollars they are given from it into such things as bike lanes, bridges and sewers.

There is no onus on the City of Kelowna to help build a single house. There is not an actual commitment for that. This is the problem: We have a government that fails to acknowledge that municipal councils are those gatekeepers. Instead of putting up a set of incentives that actually reward those that are building and punish those that are not, they have essentially written out blank cheques to these municipalities. They have also been picking winners and choosers. I know the City of West Kelowna, the District of Summerland and the District of Peachland all applied for the same funding and did not get anywhere with the government.

This scattershot approach is not working and, again, I want to focus on those young people. All of us here love this country; I really believe that we do. The problem is, if we continue to deliver the same kind of results, those young people are going to feel alienated. They are either going to opt out and not vote or vote for very extreme choices.

Routine Proceedings

• (1745)

The member for Carleton, as I have said before, has been adamant that he and our party would build the homes. On this concurrence debate, we need to discuss more about axing the tax. We need to build more homes. I wish I could get to fixing the budget and stopping the crime but I am running out of time. I am looking forward to questions in the chamber.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, sadly, the Conservative Party continues to want to play the game of filibustering, at significant expense. The people the Conservative Party is penalizing by this behaviour are Canadians. Canadians are feeling the impact of a Conservative opposition party that continues to feel entitled, to thirst for power and to filibuster government legislation to the degree it will not even allow it to go to committee.

Does the member not recognize that the official opposition has a role to play, that it also can help Canadians?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, we do not agree with the government's agenda. It is called a democracy when people can disagree. I would also disagree with the whole statement that the government thinks it has the right issues today.

My constituents are talking about unaffordability and being able to pay their bills. They want to see us axe the tax. They also want to hear us talk about housing. It is politicians who say there is a crisis and then do nothing about it. In fact, they talk about other things.

The common-sense Conservatives are the party that will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. Those are the priorities of my constituents.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have had the pleasure of working with my colleague for many months on the Standing Committee on Finance.

At the beginning of his speech, my colleague criticized the fact that the government is a big spender. In my opinion, what it spends the most on is support for the fossil fuel industry, including oil and gas and the oil sands. We can talk about the Trans Mountain pipeline, which cost \$34 billion, but we can also talk about the Minister of Finance's plan, which will cost \$83 billion. This includes, among other things, carbon capture and nuclear plants in the oil sands to make hydrogen from the gas saved. That is \$83 billion on top of the \$34 billion.

Does my hon. colleague believe, as I do, that these expenses should be reduced?

• (1750)

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I support a policy where the government is collecting the right amount of taxes.

[English]

For example, the member, at finance committee, raised legitimate questions about the so-called luxury tax, a tax on workers. We actually had industry come and say the tax will harm industry and

will push business to the United States and other places. That is a policy I 100% agree with the Bloc Québécois on.

I also suggest he look at energy in the west, particularly the natural gas in my home province of British Columbia. We could be doing good things on the environment and the economy. We could be helping to displace dirty coal right across the world.

These are some of the things we should have discussions about, and I hope we will with this gentleman and his party in the future.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague spoke about the number one issue for his constituents being affordability. That is the same issue I have heard about from constituents in my riding of Vancouver Kingsway. We come from the same province.

The NDP has addressed that in a number of ways. One was by bringing in dental care for nine million people so it would no longer be the case that they spend thousands of dollars on dental care out of their pockets. We also brought in pharmacare, and diabetes medication. I have talked to many people who have to spend thousands of dollars every year on diabetes medications and devices.

Can the member explain to us, if he is truly concerned about affordability, why he and his party voted against those two measures, which take thousands of dollars of expenses off some of the lowest-income Canadians and would obviously ease their affordability issues? Why did he oppose that?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I will give the member a practical example. My understanding is that, in the Similkameen and in Penticton proper, there have not been any sign-ups for a dentist. Maybe there has been one now, but the NDP is touting this program as being widely available and accessible to people. I have had people in Kelowna tell me they have tried to go to a different dentist, but the new dentist requires a number of X-rays that cost hundreds of dollars. They cannot afford that.

This member may believe his own rhetoric, but when we actually talk to the people trying to access the so-called dental program, we hear they cannot. It is smoke and mirrors. Many people phone me specifically because they know I am a Conservative and they want that feedback heard on the House of Commons floor.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am hoping to be able to address the motion as liberally as both the mover and the seconder have, in terms of being all over the place regarding the government agenda and some of the things the Conservative Party of Canada would like to be able to do.

Routine Proceedings

We just finished having a confidence vote. The Conservatives, in their great hunger for power, will do whatever it takes, period, end of story, to get what they want, not necessarily what Canadians want but what the leadership of the Conservative Party wants. It is unfortunate, because there is a substantial cost to the behaviour we are witnessing day in and day out from the Conservative Party. Its single focus is nothing more than to cause an election.

Fortunately, other political entities in the House of Commons recognize we are not here to serve the Conservative Party. We are here to serve and provide for Canadians in all regions of our country. In the last election, all parties were given a mandate, and that mandate was to work co-operatively in looking for ways to provide the supports that Canadians want and expect, not only the government of the day, the Liberals, but also the New Democrats, members of the Bloc and, in fact, Conservative members of the House of Commons.

The Conservative Party has been consistent since day one after the last federal election. One only needs to look at the actions Conservatives have taken. It was greatly amplified over the summer, to the degree that they are even getting a little giddy, I would suggest. Unfortunately, adding to that giddiness, some serious issues are flowing out of the leader of the Conservative Party's office, and that really concerns a lot of Canadians.

We have witnessed a Conservative Party shift to the extreme right. We have even seen Progressive Conservative prime ministers be exceptionally critical of the new Reform-Conservative party we see today.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Name one.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I will give more than one. I can name three: Joe Clark, Kim Campbell and Brian Mulroney. All three of them have been critical of today's Conservative-Reform party.

Joe Clark will say that he never left the Progressive Conservative Party; that party left him. Brian Mulroney was on the record saying that the Conservative Party has amputated the progressive nature of the Conservative Party. Some of the stuff Kim Campbell says is unparliamentary, so I will not say what she has to say, in particular, about the leader of the Conservative Party.

The Conservative right is heavily influenced by the MAGA movement coming out of the States and the types of things we are seeing in the States that Canadians do not support or like or, in good part, are in fear of. There is a very negative side to politics stateside that Canadians do not like.

We had a vote today and information went out. I do not know how the Conservatives got a specific email address that gets funnelled to me, but there was a vote today on a confidence motion, and the Conservatives lost. They did not get what they wanted.

• (1755)

Within minutes, I received an email. I do not know how my name came to be on this list, but I suspect it is a fairly extensive list. Here is one of the quotes from the email from the Conservative Party of Canada: “[Blank] is SPINELESS. He's a fake, a phony, a fraud, and a LIAR.” I will let members fill in the name.

These are very strong words. This is something that the Conservative Party of Canada sent out today to I suspect literally millions of Canadians. I have no idea how I ended up on this list. Using their AI, we will see if Conservatives are going to find out how I ended up on this list. This is not the first email I have received in the last few days. At the very end of the email, they want me to donate.

An hon. member: Don't do it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Do not worry, I will not be donating. It is easy to resist it.

Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party today is all about misinformation. It is about negativity. Conservatives will go as low as one can get into the gutter, or at least the leadership of the Conservative Party will. Conservatives do not have any problems going low.

In fact, a couple of weeks back, and I cannot really recall when it was, I was on a CTV panel where there was no Conservative representative. I am told Conservatives do not want to participate in panels. Yesterday, I was on a CBC panel, and Conservatives do not participate on CBC panels. Yesterday, the leader of the Conservative Party and Conservative Party members made a decision that they do not like CBC and CTV.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: One of them is saying, “Hear, hear!”

Madam Speaker, now the Conservatives are saying that they do not want to be accountable through media like the CTVs or the CBCs of Canada because they do not have confidence in those national news broadcasters. It is because they do not want to answer the questions that are being posed to them. Instead, they want to rely on social media.

There is a reference to the leader of the Conservative Party being very similar to Trump. That might be a bit of a disservice to Donald Trump. Quite frankly, I am very disappointed in the direction the far-right Conservative Party is going today. There is also no sign of its members changing their attitudes. Look at the attitude of hate that Conservatives are promoting and the information they are providing to people.

Today, Conservatives brought forward a motion, and that motion is in keeping with their slogans. I will give them that much. Darn, they are good at slogans. They have slogans; they have bumper stickers. They are ready and itching to get them out there. The problem is that everything is based on a foundation of sand. At the end of the day, there is nothing to it but slogans and bumper stickers, which are supported by misinformation.

Routine Proceedings

One of the examples I could give is related to what Conservative members have been talking a lot about already today. If someone were to do a Hansard search, how many Conservative members of Parliament would we find who have actually said anything about cutting the carbon rebates? I suspect we would not find any. How many have said, “cut the carbon tax”? I suspect, on average, each one has said it 10 times. Some have said it a couple hundred times, and others have not said it because they have not spoken.

● (1800)

I can suggest to members that, when Conservatives go to Canadians and say that they are going to save Canadians money, as they have said inside the chamber, by cutting the carbon tax, that is not true. More than 80% of the constituents that I represent get a carbon rebate. That rebate amount is more than the carbon tax that they pay. That means that their net income, their disposable income, is increased. That is the reality. Members do not have to believe me. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, who is independent, will tell us that.

Conservatives will spread misinformation because it sounds good. Some provinces do not even have the carbon tax, yet they will go to those provinces and say that they are going to cut the carbon tax, giving a false impression. The other day in debate, there was one member in the Conservative Party who stood up and said that a 34% cost increase on food is a direct result of the carbon tax. What a bunch of garbage. That is absolutely ridiculous. I challenged the member on that statement, and then I challenged a couple of other members on the statement this particular member made. They do not change their opinions on it, even if they are confronted with facts.

They do not change their opinions because they are so focused on that thirst for power. At the end of the day, they are not concerned about what is happening for Canadians, the day-to-day living that Canadians have to put up with, let alone the important issues that the House of Commons deals with on a daily basis.

Today, we were supposed to debate Bill C-71. Bill C-71 is a bill to ensure that individuals who should have never have lost their citizenship will be given their Canadian citizenship. Every political party, except for the Conservatives, supports that legislation. Conservatives do not even want to debate it now. They will not allow it to be debated. They do not want it to go to committee.

Members will say that the Conservatives do not support that one, but they do support Bill C-66. They say that they support it. That bill takes sexual harassment and rape victims who are going through military courts and transfers them into civil courts. Every member of the House of Commons, the Conservatives, the Bloc, New Democrats, Greens and, of course, Liberals, supports that legislation. Members would think that the Conservatives would allow that bill to go to committee, but no. Instead, they want to filibuster. They brought forward another concurrence report.

They say that they are concerned about the economy. Members can take a look at Bill C-33, which we were supposed to be debating last week, to enhance our trading opportunities. What did the Conservative members do? They did not want to debate that either, so they brought in another concurrence report, which prevented the government from being able to debate that legislation.

The members opposite, in criticizing the government today, were talking about issues of crime. They say that this is what they want to talk about. I will remind them of Bill C-63, the online harms act. That is to protect children being extorted, being bullied. The whole issue of exploitation of our young children, we were supposed to debate that last week, but no, the Conservatives said no to that too, and they brought forward a concurrence report. The Conservative Party is going out of its way to prevent any legislation from going to committee.

● (1805)

Prior to getting up, I had a member of one of the opposition parties approach me, asking why we do not just move to orders of the day. I think there was a great deal of effort and thought to move towards orders of the day because then maybe we could get on with actually providing movement on some of this legislation. The problem is that we are a minority government. In a minority government, we cannot go to orders of the day unless we get an opposition party that says it will support the government moving to orders of the day so that we can get rid of the games that the Conservative party has been playing.

Let there be no doubt that, no matter how critical the Conservative Party is, how much of a roadblock the Conservatives want to present or how much of a character assassination that they are after for those in the government, the Prime Minister and the government will continue to be focused on the interests of Canadians in all regions of our country. That is something we will continue to focus on day in and day out. That means that, whether the Conservatives want it or not, we will continue to develop policy ideas that will transform into budgetary measures and legislative measures. There will come a time when Canadians will, in fact, evaluate and take a look at what the Conservative Party has been doing between now and whenever the next election is, and what other political entities have done.

I think there is a sense of responsibility for all of us to be able to accomplish good things for Canadians. That is what I liked about the agreement that was achieved between the Liberals and the New Democrats. I have always been a big fan of the pharmacare plan. I have always been a very strong advocate for a national health care system that supports our provinces, which administer health care. For over 30 years as a parliamentarian, those are the types of issues that have been important for me. As a government, those issues have been important for us.

We were able to get support from the New Democrats to advance a number of wonderful health care initiatives. That is what it means to put people first, putting the constituents of Canada ahead of partisan politics. By doing that, the government has invested \$198 billion over 10 years in health care. That is for future generations. We have developed a dental care program. To date, over 700,000 people have had access to it. Members can think of diabetes, or of contraceptives, and how, as a government working with an opposition party, we are, in fact, making a difference. In fact, I have suggested that one of the other things we should possibly be looking at is shingles and how pharmacare might be able to deal with that particular issue.

Routine Proceedings

These are the types of ideas that we are talking about within the Liberal Party to build a stronger, healthier health care system, while the Conservative Party wants to tear it down. That is a part of the Conservative far-right hidden agenda. People need to be aware of that. By the time we get to the election, I believe that throughout that election, we will see the Conservative sand fade away. There is no foundation to what they are saying. It is just bumper stickers and slogans. That is all they have. We can contrast that to the many progressive measures we have taken as a government, in good part because of the cooperation of opposition parties.

I ask the Conservatives to stop playing the games, stop bringing in Conservative motions of concurrence and allow debate on government legislation. A responsible Conservative opposition could still bring in the motions it wants, while at least allowing debates to occur on legislation. Allow these important pieces of legislation to go to committee where they can be studied, where they can come back and where they can provide hope for many. That is the very least that Conservatives can do: put Canadians ahead of their own political party.

• (1810)

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo. Before I begin my question, I just want to wish my mother a very happy birthday.

I do not know where to start. This is a member who talks about wasting House resources, but he has probably spoken more than every single member on that side combined. I have seen him repeatedly stand up when there are strong women sitting in front of him, behind him and around him.

This is a feminist government, they say. Talk to Jody Wilson-Raybould. Talk to Jane Philpott. Talk to the finance minister in a year or two. The government is unbelievable in its hypocrisy. The member talks about us being negative, but all he did was talk negatively. If he wants to change politics in Canada, he should look in the mirror.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we recognize, as I am sure the member opposite does, that when it comes to legislation, if members of the Conservative Party want to stop legislation, all they have to do is stand up and speak. They can go from one member to the next member to the next member. They have 100 members. They could kill all legislation.

I recognize that the official opposition, as an opposition party, has a lot of tools in its tool box to prevent legislation from passing. Good for them. However, at the end of the day, I wish they would start thinking about not what is in the best interests of the Conservative Party of Canada, but what is in the best interests of Canadians. I truly believe that if they started to do that, we would see more things taking place in a positive fashion on the floor of the House of Commons.

I can assure the member opposite that my critique of his opposition party and its leader does not come even close to the type of behaviour that we witness coming from the Conservative ranks.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I remember my first day in the House five years ago. I was impressed by my colleague from Winnipeg North's passion and spirit and by the decibel level he was able to reach in his speeches. Again today, he does not disappoint. From him, I have learned that it is possible to answer a specific question without turning away from it. That is what I like about my colleague.

In the report of the Standing Committee on Finance that we are currently discussing, the Bloc Québécois made the suggestion to "Increase the Old Age Security pension for seniors aged 65 to 74 and review the method for indexing to account for wage growth in Canada".

I would like to ask my colleague a simple question, and I would imagine that he will once again amaze me with a simple answer. Is he in favour of such a proposal?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, after those kind words, I do not want to disappoint the member of the Bloc. I can say that much. I do know that in less than an hour, we will be debating a very important motion that the Bloc is bringing forward, and hopefully I will be able to give a more detailed response then.

Suffice it to say, for now, if we look at what the government has proposed and done for seniors in Canada over the last number of years, I would highlight, because I know this is what the member is most interested in, the issue of those aged 75 plus and OAS. In our federal election platform, we made the commitment to increase OAS for seniors aged 75 plus. The reason is that we needed to recognize that the needs of someone aged 75 plus are greater. I am thinking of medical expenses as an example, and the ability to generate supplementary income, along with the shrinking—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry. The hon. member's time is up. I have been trying to signal to him.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, just so the folks at home completely understand, we are doing this concurrence debate on a finance committee report, a pre-budget report, for a budget that has already been passed. If people at home are wondering what is going on, we are spending approximately \$70,000 an hour because the Conservatives have decided to block debating legislation that would help people and block debate on the capital gains increases. Why? It is because the highest income earners, the 1.5% of tax filers with a total income over \$250,000, are going to receive 61% of individual capital gains. That is why. They are here protecting their friends.

My colleague said he always supported pharmacare and dental care, but he voted against them both times before they came forward.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on that point, I can recall, shortly after my daughter was elected back in 2015 or 2016, being out on Keewatin Street, taking signs out and having a wonderful story about pharmacare. I was a health critic for a couple of years when I was in the Manitoba legislature. Pharmacare is something that I believe should be there, and I am glad that we were able to work together to ensure that we have programs like pharmacare moving forward.

In regard to Bill C-71, I know that one of the member's colleagues has been a very strong advocate for it. The NDP has attempted to get Bill C-71 through the House, and last fall I think it was all the way through, recognizing the importance of the bill. We appreciate the support that we receive from opposition members, because we need that kind of support to get things passed.

• (1820)

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to echo the comments by the member for Courtenay—Alberni about the ridiculous nature of this debate and the cost of it to Canadian taxpayers. However, it does give us a chance to talk about some of the important elements of the government's work.

I am wondering if the member for Winnipeg North could talk a bit more about the dental care plan, because it is one of those areas that I believe the NDP likes to take credit for. We are willing to share credit for it. We think it is an example of Parliament working well, and I am wondering if the member could offer some comments on that.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there is such a keen interest in ensuring that the dental care program continues to grow and survive, and we want to make sure that everyone ultimately receives that benefit. Take a look at the numbers. For it to succeed, we have to bring it through past spring. Then we will see that all Canadians have access to it.

To give a sense of it, there are 750,000 patients already, 2.4 million approvals and 21,000 providers or dentists. That is an incredible take-up on a wonderful program. That program is there because of a sense of co-operation, and a lot of good people, in particular among the Liberals and the New Democrats, wanted to see it. We have to ensure that it stays.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to go back to the question asked by my friend, the member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

As the parliamentary secretary said, we will be discussing Bill C-319 shortly. However, what is in Bill C-319 is also in the report we are discussing. A majority of the committee, including the Liberals, supported this measure. For Bill C-319, we need a royal recommendation from the government.

The parliamentary secretary represents the government. Will he commit to providing the royal recommendation, yes or no?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I will get a chance a bit later to add some more thoughts on the issue, but for now I will

say that we love our seniors. As a government, virtually from day one, there have been dramatic increases to the GIS to ensure that we support our seniors. We have lifted literally hundreds of thousands of them out of poverty by that one policy initiative.

Fast-forward to the pandemic. During the pandemic, one-time payments were given to seniors. Fast-forward to the millions and millions that we provide toward programming, which ultimately supports seniors in all the different regions of the country.

I believe that as a government, hopefully going forward, as in the past, we will be able to continue these types of supports for our seniors.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I was surprised to learn this afternoon that we were going to discuss the Standing Committee on Finance's report on the pre-budget consultations from February.

Although the report was tabled in February, most of the work was done the previous fall. We worked very long hours in committee, where we heard from many witnesses so that we could take all aspects and needs of Quebec's economy and, of course, Canada's economy into account.

We even toured the provinces during the two break weeks. During the first break week, in October 2023, we went to the Maritimes, and during the break week in November, we visited all the other provinces, starting in Quebec and ending in British Columbia. There is nothing like going out into the community and hearing directly from the people. It gives groups and witnesses a chance to take part in the discussions and tell us about their needs and their realities. It makes our work easier so that we can better sense and understand what is happening on the ground.

Members may be wondering what a member of the Bloc Québécois could possibly be doing travelling all over Canada and listening to organizations in other provinces. First, their needs may overlap with those of Quebec. Second, we also invited all of the organizations that defend the rights of francophones in all of the provinces of Canada. That gave us the opportunity to make contacts, gain a better understanding of francophones' realities and see how they are often isolated and have to fight to continue speaking one of the two official languages. There is still a lot of work to be done. Obviously, we continue to stand in solidarity with Franco-Canadians and always will.

From our consultations, we developed a series of recommendations that we presented to the government. Obviously, we are in constant contact with the government. The minister even has staff who follow the work in committee and who can see what recommendations may be made in the future. It is an important job to keep the minister and her team informed of the needs of the Canadian economy and also of Quebec's economy, which is what matters to the Bloc Québécois.

Routine Proceedings

The report begins by noting that all the recommendations must be read and considered “in accordance with the powers of each jurisdiction”. This is an important show of respect in regard to interference. It serves as a reminder to the government that, when the political system was developed, the decision was made to create a federation. That was the compromise. In fact, we know that John A. Macdonald and his friends wanted a legislative union where everything would be decided in Ottawa, but others disagreed. For Quebec to get on board, there had to be levels of government that were equally sovereign in their own areas of jurisdiction.

However, what I have seen in the House since 2015—and this was also the case in previous years—is that the government is clearly tempted to constantly grab new powers, to centralize power, to want to make all the decisions. This goes against legal instruments and, more importantly, it flies in the face of respect for my nation, the Quebec nation. The very beginning of the report, therefore, reiterates the importance that all recommendations be made with respect for each government's areas of jurisdiction.

When my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean and I asked the parliamentary secretary questions, we brought up a recommendation that we care about in the report currently under discussion. A majority of elected members in committee, including the Liberals, passed this recommendation. I would like to quote it.

It recommends that the government:

Increase the Old Age Security pension for seniors aged 65 to 74 and review the method for indexing to account for wage growth in Canada.

In barely half an hour, the House will discuss the bill introduced by my esteemed colleague from Shefford precisely to support an OAS increase for seniors aged 65 to 74. In its report, the Standing Committee on Finance advised the government and all members to support this bill. That is very important. In fact, all the parties supported the bill. The problem is that the government must give the royal recommendation to allow the bill to be studied further.

• (1825)

The Bloc Québécois told this government, which is now a minority government, that if it wants our support for the next few months, it has to support Bill C-319 by giving it a royal recommendation. That is very important. It is a very important measure. It is about dignity.

We look forward to hearing the government's response, which will tell us whether we will continue working in the House for the well-being of seniors and young retirees in Quebec and across Canada, or whether we should hop on our buses and go talk to everyone and find out how many Liberal members will be left in the House after the election. The choice is up to the government.

We are talking about seniors aged 65 to 74 because the government increased old age security for seniors aged 75 and over. That is great, but if the pension had been increased starting at age 65, I would be clapping with both hands. However, since the increase is only for 75 and up, I can only clap with one hand, because the job is only half done. Now a significant inequity needs to be corrected.

Why do we want to enhance the OAS? It is a federal support program, and there are not a lot of those. This is a jurisdictional matter. When the program was created, the idea was to index it annually to

the average wage. For decades, that did not happen. The pension ended up being too small to enable seniors to live with a modicum of dignity. A top-up was required, and one was provided for seniors 75 and up, but there is still a huge gap for those 65 to 74. Now seniors are divided into two classes: those who are entitled to dignity and those who are not. Why is this happening? It is unacceptable.

My parents are 71 and 72. The physical health, well-being and financial security of people who are between 65 and 74 varies quite a bit. That is where the idea for a universal program came from. Under this program, those who earn a lot of money do not get the full pension because they have enough money. However, the program is there to help those who have needs. That is the point of a social program. The OAS should be indexed to the increase in the average wage to allow seniors to retain that dignity.

There may be some people in that age bracket who had very physically demanding jobs and who are physically unable to continue working. They need to rest, and that rest is well deserved. We need to be there for those men and women. I mention women here because, quite often, the people who do not have a private pension plan, RRSP or employer pension plan are women.

Often they are women because, when we ask people to be caregivers, to lend a hand and to make a contribution, unfortunately, in our society, there is still a lot of inequity. Too often, women are the ones who are asked to make sacrifices for the well-being of others. When elderly parents need a caregiver, very often, it is a woman who quits her job to help her parents.

During that time, she is not contributing to the Quebec pension plan, if she lives in Quebec, or to the Canada pension plan. She cannot contribute to a private plan either. Then, if her husband gets sick, she is the one who will once again sacrifice her job and her career to take care of him. It is often the same thing with children.

Quite often, it is women who make these sacrifices and have to forgo the more dignified retirement they might have had. Social programs such as the OAS are there to support them. Statistics show that senior women who live alone are overrepresented among the poor. It is important to restore fairness and justice.

Routine Proceedings

• (1830)

Women often give of themselves to support the well-being of others, so the least we can do is restore some balance with a social safety net to catch them. We need to give seniors aged 65 to 74 something. We need to increase the OAS, which was not indexed to inflation or the average wage. It is a matter of dignity. It is one of the federal government's core responsibilities, so we are asking it to take action.

All parties supported the measure, and it is up to the government to give royal assent. The Bloc Québécois sees this as a matter of confidence in the government. Is the government there to help people? Is it there to help people in need within the limits of its jurisdiction? If so, this is a golden opportunity to prove it. Our confidence in the government will depend on it.

I am the finance critic and my counterpart is the Minister of Finance. Like most of her colleagues, she is particularly talented at extending congratulations, boasting, networking and maintaining good relations. While that may often save time, it does not result in any serious work or specific commitments. That is why, this morning, my leader, together with the party officers, announced that we are setting a deadline. If this bill is not in force by October 29, if it has not received a royal recommendation and royal assent by that date, we will work with the other opposition parties to discuss whether we still have confidence in the government. It is a matter of dignity.

Furthermore, the Minister of Finance told me that this bill would cost an estimated \$3 billion a year. She said that it is expensive, that it is a lot of money. Well, that is what governing is all about. Governing means making choices.

We have resources. How do we allocate them? What do we spend them on? Three billion dollars a year is expensive, yet the Trans Mountain pipeline cost \$34 billion. That is very expensive for a heavily polluting industry whose companies earn record profits, astronomical profits. Most of the dividends paid out by these companies leave Canada and go to other economic interests. It is an industry that does not need money, but the government gives it \$34 billion to help it out. However, \$3 billion is apparently too much to spend on seniors aged 65 to 74, who are often women living alone. Does the government work for the oil lobbies, or does it work for people in need? That is what we are wondering, and its decision on the royal recommendation will give us an answer.

I talked about the \$34 billion for Trans Mountain, compared to the \$3 billion a year needed to increase the OAS. I would also like to talk about the Minister of Finance's plan for what she calls a "green economy". We see right through that. We know this government's newspeak. In its newspeak, "green economy" means "support for fossil fuel industries". Its plan to provide \$83 billion over the next few years has multiple components, but it essentially involves programs made to measure for the oil and gas industry, which, I repeat, has no need of government support, is highly profitable and rakes in record profits year after year.

Catherine McKenna, the Liberal Party's former environment minister, said it better than anyone, I think. The oil and gas industry needs no support. We paid \$34 billion for Trans Mountain and \$83 billion for programs like carbon capture. Does the industry

need that? The government says that it does and that this \$83 billion is more important than \$3 billion for seniors, who, as I said, are often women living alone who need this money to maintain a modicum of dignity.

Governing is about making choices. The government is now a minority government. If it wants to dance with us, it needs to stop serving this extremely profitable industry that does not need support. Instead, it needs to focus on the people who actually need support, as we are proposing in Bill C-319, which will be debated shortly, within the limits of its jurisdiction. That is very important.

The \$83 billion includes carbon capture. The oil sands industry is getting help to set up small modular nuclear reactors to heat the sands, which will help it save on gas. The gas could be exported, because that is so environmentally friendly, using the new Coastal GasLink pipeline. It could also be used to make hydrogen, because that \$83 billion also includes a tailor-made plan to transform the gas saved thanks to the nuclear reactors into hydrogen, which can then be exported.

• (1835)

Is that the government's vision for the future, its green vision?

Meanwhile, it says that investing \$3 billion a year for seniors aged 65 to 74 who need it is too expensive. Among the OECD countries, which are basically the 30 richest countries, Canada is near the bottom in terms of the gap between pre- and post-retirement income. This is called the replacement rate. This means that Canada is basically the country where a person's income drops the most when they stop working and retire. That has to change.

The reason Canada is doing so poorly is that the existing social programs were not indexed. The government needs to ensure the dignity of its citizens within the limits of its jurisdictions. In this case, we are talking about the OAS, which falls under federal jurisdiction. Past governments failed in their duty by refusing to index the OAS, gradually undermining seniors' dignity. The government topped up the payments for seniors aged 75 and up, but it decided to abandon another class of seniors, those aged 65 to 74. This is now a matter of confidence for the Bloc Québécois. It is a matter of dignity. The OECD data remind us that Canada has fallen very far behind and is doing very poorly in this area.

Routine Proceedings

Three billion dollars a year is a fair amount of money, but baby boomers are about to retire in droves. Given the very low replacement rate, their income will drop, which will have an indirect impact on the entire economy. What will their consumption levels look like? If they have access to a decent income, they will be able to maintain minimum consumption levels and help keep the economy running smoothly. If not, then we could experience an economic slowdown.

In this regard, I would like to remind members of the situation in Japan. Japan's population has been aging at a faster rate than in other countries. The economy has stagnated faster than elsewhere, with sluggish growth rates and deflation, because seniors, who no longer need to buy new cars and new homes, will limit their consumption. It is partly a cultural choice, but that does not always explain it; Japan also has poverty issues that have led the entire economy to stagnate since the nineties. That needs to be looked at. It is a matter of dignity, but it is also a matter of ensuring a well-functioning economy.

I will stop here for the part of the report that supports our Bill C-319, which we will debate in exactly 18 minutes from now. However, I will make one last point in the minute I have left.

It concerns another recommendation in the report that has to do with supply management. That recommendation, which was supported by the Liberal members who form the government, reads as follows:

Make no further concessions on supply-managed products in future trade negotiations by supporting Bill C-282, An Act to amend the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act (supply management).

The bill has gone through all the stages. It is now before the Senate. I hope the Senate moves quickly to pass it. I hope the government and the Liberal members here are talking to their friends in the other place. They do not sit very often but, for once, they have a very important job to do. We need to pass Bill C-282 as quickly as possible in order to implement it, as the majority of members of the Standing Committee on Finance expressed in the report we are discussing here.

For too long, our farmers have borne the brunt of trade agreements. For too long, we have chosen to sacrifice our farmers in order to ink a deal. For us, land use means respecting our farmers and, in this case, respecting supply management.

● (1840)

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know that we are here because of the Conservatives' squabbling. I congratulate my colleague from Joliette, who took the time to talk about things that are actually important. I would like to thank him. He mentioned that there are issues that affect women in particular, both in Quebec and across Canada. One of the most important programs we implemented, in my opinion, is the one that offers \$10-a-day day care. Thanks to that program, there has been a historic increase in the number of women in the workforce.

Is my colleague concerned about the Conservatives making cuts to the program? It would be unfortunate for women in his riding and across Canada.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for asking his question in French. His effort is much appreciated.

Quebec adopted a family policy in the late 1990s. While the Liberal government was cutting all social transfers to the provinces in order to balance its budget, we decided to roll up our sleeves and forge ahead. Although it is far from perfect, we adopted a pharmaceutical plan to support people who could not afford their prescription drugs, and we adopted an entire family policy with subsidized day care. We even set up child care centres, which are day care centres with a strong educational program. We did that in the late 1990s, more than 25 years ago. Quebec did not wait for the federal government.

Obviously, this program allows the federal government to finance some of Quebec's costs, which enables Quebec to offer better services. We applaud the program and we support it. Lastly, to answer my colleague's question, yes, we are concerned.

● (1845)

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always interesting to listen to my colleague. I would like to get back to the Bloc Québécois's ultimatum and the October 29 deadline. I have two questions.

My colleague appears to go further than his own leader with this ultimatum. His leader said he was prepared to negotiate if the government ignores the Bloc Québécois's demands. However, my colleague expressly said that if he did not get a response by October 29, he would begin discussions to trigger an election. That is my first question.

My second question is as follows: Why October 29? At the current rate of opposition days, there will be no more opposition days on October 29. It will be even more difficult for our three parties to trigger an election.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, first of all, I think my leader was clear, and that mirrored what I said here. Second, October 29 is the date that was chosen based on the fact that we will be discussing Bill C-319 later today and proceeding to the vote next week. This bill will then be sent to the Senate. We chose this date to ensure that everything would be passed here by then. That is the analysis that took place.

As for opposition days, there are plenty of ways for us to proceed. We will keep an eye on that, of course.

[English]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have worked with my colleague for many years. I really appreciate him. He always comes to the House trying to bring forward ideas on tax fairness. He is doing that again today.

Routine Proceedings

We know seniors are feeling the pinch when it comes to the housing crisis and inflation. What is being proposed, and what he is talking about in his speech, is about making sure that those who are 65 to 74 will get the same benefit in the OAS as those who are 75 and over. In that way, we would not have a two-tiered seniors benefit. I appreciate that.

When we look at the corporate tax rate, back in 2015, the PBO calculated that it generated \$2.6 billion per 1% of tax for corporations. That would be roughly about \$3 billion today, so that would equate to a 1% increase in corporate taxes. Instead of choosing corporate welfare, because we have the lowest corporate tax rate in the G7, how is that playing out? Big oil, big banks and big grocery are having record profits. Meanwhile, seniors are living in poverty.

Would my colleague support a 1% increase in corporate tax, or a windfall tax, on big oil, big grocery and big banks? Because we know that we did it to the big banks, which generated billions of dollars. There was a report done by the PBO that said big oil, with the same taxation, would generate \$4.2 billion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I would like to start by returning all the compliments I received from my hon. colleague for Courtenay—Alberni. I also consider him an outstanding member who works for people, for those who sometimes run into problems. Social equity is very important to him, as his question showed.

My personal fight in the House is a fight against tax havens. How do we make unlawful that which is immoral? Why is it that the banks, by using obscure clauses written in fine print and buried among tens of thousands of pages, are allowed to get away with paying less tax by artificially, virtually, declaring the profits they earn in Canada through subsidiaries in the Caribbean Islands or elsewhere? That is unacceptable.

Equity must exist across the entire economy and throughout society as a whole. For example, if oil companies are making record profits while severe poverty is creating problems, we have to ask whether something can be done to redistribute wealth in a better way. The Scandinavian example has shown us that a better distribution of wealth benefits everyone in the end. Solidarity generates economic growth.

● (1850)

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by commending the speech by my esteemed colleague from Joliette, whose speeches are always well structured. That is evident here, and I think it inspires confidence in my colleagues too, based on comments we have heard from other members of the various parties.

As everyone knows, increasing old age security is a key issue for the Bloc Québécois. In my region, in the Lower St. Lawrence, one in four people is over 65. Within 20 years, it will be one in three. This means that the wave will hit us before it hits the other regions of Quebec.

My colleague talked about dignity and responsibility, but also about recognizing the folks who built the Quebec we know today. I

would like him to confirm once again that we need to move forward and increase old age security for all seniors, especially those aged 65 to 74, who are currently being discriminated against.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague and friend from Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, who does an extraordinary job for the people of his riding. I also thank him for all the work he does in the House. He raised a number of very important points.

First of all, he reminded us that a very high proportion of the people in his largely rural riding are over 65. This concerns us once again when it comes to land use. We know that, on average, the population in the regions, outside the cities, tends to be older. If we do not recognize seniors with the support they deserve, are we working against land use?

Also, as he said, that proportion will continue to get bigger. The time to act is now to ensure economic stability, especially in the regions.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, today my party's leader asked the Prime Minister to tell us how important Bill C-282, on supply management, is to him. The Prime Minister told him that he promised farmers he would never undermine supply management in international agreements again.

I would like my colleague to tell me the difference between the Prime Minister's promise and Bill C-282.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, when the Prime Minister makes a promise, that only matters to people who want to believe it. If he is not there anymore or changes his mind, then it is worthless. However, if there is legislation in place and a government wants to go against it, it will have to introduce a bill to reverse it and then defend its decision to the farmers. I say good luck, Charlie Brown.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the federal government's 2024-25 budget included an important reform to the taxation of capital gains. Changing the way we tax capital gains is something that has been called for by progressive voices in this country for decades.

Capital gains occur when an asset is sold for more than it costs to acquire and maintain. However, there are a number of very important exceptions to this rule, including Canadians' principal residences and other types of assets.

Routine Proceedings

Capital gains are generally heavily concentrated among high-income Canadians, more so than any other form of income. Making matters worse, they benefit from lucrative tax preferences. Until this year and this change, recipients only had to declare half their capital gains on their income tax, which is the so-called inclusion rate of 50%, and the other half was entirely tax-free. Therefore, if a person bought an asset for half a million dollars and sold it for a million dollars, half of that \$500,000 profit was completely tax-free. This could be a second home, a building or stocks.

In contrast, other forms of income, such as wages and salaries, must be fully reported on a tax return. I think Canadians are well aware of that. In other words, the inclusion rate for salaries and wages is 100%. Teachers, waitresses, firefighters, truck drivers, plumbers, office workers and cleaners have to declare and pay tax on 100% of their income, as does pretty much every person who goes to work every day and has a job. However, people who are trading stocks, selling secondary residences or selling large assets do not. They only have to declare half of their profit, and the other half goes in their pocket tax-free.

The federal budget announced a change in the capital gains inclusion rate. As of June 24 of this year, it rose to 66.7% for capital gains inclusion declared by corporations. This means that, instead of sheltering 50% of their profits, corporations can now only shelter one-third. However, they still get to shelter one-third of their profits.

The inclusion rate for individuals remains at 50%, the way it has always been for many decades, for all capital gains under \$250,000. It will be increased to 66.7% for any capital gains declared above \$250,000 in a single year. In other words, half of the capital gains for an individual is still tax-free under \$250,000, and a third of their capital gains above \$250,000 is still tax-free. Therefore, the tax benefit to capital gains in this country is still lucrative, just modestly less so.

Now, the number of individuals directly affected by this change is very small. Canada Revenue Agency data indicates that only about 0.1% of tax filers, which is about 40,000 people in this country, report over \$250,000 of capital gains per year. The proportion of Canadians who would declare over \$250,000 in capital gains in any year in their lives is also very small.

While the number of Canadians significantly affected by this change is small, these Canadians are mighty. This reform, which has been advocated for many years by tax specialist and equality advocates, as I said, will primarily have an impact on the richest Canadians. They are very powerful, as are their allies and advisers in the financial sector. Therefore, this new policy is being aggressively resisted by an alliance of wealthy Canadians, financial advisers and Conservatives.

The Conservative leader has promised to reverse these capital gains tax reforms, and he is trying to start a broader revolt against taxes in general and the public programs they pay for. The campaign against capital gains tax reform has relied on scare tactics and outright misinformation about who will be affected, how much extra they will pay and even why capital gains are taxed at all. In fact, the reason we are here tonight is that the Conservatives have decided to move a motion with some 360 recommendations. These were

made to the finance committee before the last budget, the one that was introduced here in April. These come from recommendations that were made in February as a way to stall the introduction of a ways and means motion that would pave the way for these capital gains inclusion changes. That is why we are here tonight: The Conservatives are stalling tax fairness.

● (1855)

New Democrats believe, as the Carter commission in the 1960s found, that a buck is a buck is a buck, and that is how taxes should work. It should not matter whether one gets their income in the form of a dividend or a capital gain, or through their hard work in a salary or wage; it should be taxed the same. That is the principle that came out of the royal commission in the 1960s.

However, the Conservatives are doing the bidding of the wealthiest people in this country, people who have capital gains over \$250,000. They do not want that money to be taxed the same way that wages are.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but I have to interrupt the hon. member and also interrupt the proceedings on the motion at this time. Accordingly, the debate on the motion will be rescheduled for another sitting.

[*Translation*]

It being 6:59 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

Before the House proceeds to Private Members' Business, the Chair wishes to remind members that pursuant to the decision made on Thursday, May 11, 2023, a royal recommendation is required for Bill C-319, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act regarding amount of full pension, since the bill would appropriate part of the public revenue.

● (1900)

[*English*]

Accordingly, if the bill is concurred in at report stage, the question will only be put on the motion for third reading of the bill if a royal recommendation is submitted in due time.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***OLD AGE SECURITY ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-319, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act (amount of full pension), as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There being no motion at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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.

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Madam Speaker, I ask that Bill C-319 be carried unanimously at report stage.

(Motion agreed to)

Ms. Andr anne Larouche moved that the bill be now read a third time and do pass.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It might have been just because of interpretation. We did want to see the bill go to third reading, but we did not want to see it go unanimously. I am not too sure whether that was being suggested.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I did correct the record, and it was adopted.

Mr. Blake Richards: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I was a little unclear because you did say that it was adopted on division and you are now saying—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I cleared it up. When I asked if it was being adopted, nobody stood up to say otherwise so it was adopted, and not on division.

The hon. member for Shefford has the floor.

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Madam Speaker, we have reached a crucial stage for this bill. Here is what I was thinking. Given everything that we are hearing, how should I discuss Bill C-319 at third reading stage?

I will begin with a brief introduction and a little background.

I want to make it clear that, when I talk about Bill C-319 and age discrimination, this is something that I care a lot about. Perhaps there are people who do not know this about me, but before I became an MP, I worked for over two years at a community organization as a project manager responsible for raising awareness of elder abuse and intimidation.

I wanted to take my work on the issue of discrimination and prejudice against seniors even further. That is one of the reasons I decided to go into politics. I am not the only one who wanted to work on this issue. When I decided to go into politics, I gave it a lot of thought. I remember very well that, leading up to the 2019 election campaign, I was not the only one who wanted to do something to help seniors. The member for Beloeil—Chambly, the leader of the Bloc Qu b cois, wanted to bring this issue to the table in the House of Commons. While we were hoping that the Bloc Qu b cois would make a comeback in the House at the time, the Bloc leader already intended to bring the issue of seniors before the House, because he had noticed that the House had not talked about that issue for a long time. The House was not talking enough about seniors. Helping seniors is really part of the Bloc Qu b cois's DNA.

I also remember that, before I was asked to take on this campaign and bring the issue of seniors back to the forefront in the House of Commons, I worked as an assistant to a Bloc Qu b cois member from 2007 to 2011. I was in charge of constituent cases. I realized that the most frequent questions were about the guaranteed income supplement and the fact that it was not completely automatic and not easy for seniors to access. Bloc members were the ones who worked on this issue, determining how to make the GIS payment automatic, how to ensure that more of our eligible seniors would get it. Seniors were already on the Bloc's radar.

I took a break from politics and worked in the community. As I said, before I was elected, I worked with groups, round tables and seniors' groups. We were already talking about this discrimination against seniors back then. We were talking about how too many seniors are financially vulnerable. That topic was already being discussed. It is nothing new. We were talking about it before the Bloc Qu b cois came back with a vengeance in 2019.

I will briefly give some background. During the election campaign, the Liberals were already talking about increasing pensions by 10% for people aged 75 or over. I remember that we stood out early on in campaign debates because we were already arguing that creating two classes of seniors was wrong, that it was not done, and that we had to increase old age security, the universal program for everyone, starting at age 65. That is how the program operates. That is the base amount provided at retirement. This issue became the focus of the first questions we asked when the House returned in December 2019. Even then, we were asking the government about this legislation, about its plans to discriminate on the basis of age.

Private Members' Business

When we came back in early 2020, my colleague from Joliette and I met with the Fédération de l'Âge d'Or du Québec, or FADOQ, at the Olympic Stadium in Montreal as part of our pre-budget meetings. One of FADOQ's demands was to increase old age security, but for all seniors, starting at age 65. FADOQ members had also heard rumours that the government was thinking of increasing pensions for people aged 75 and over. They were the ones who asked us to champion this demand, which was a priority for them. We made it a condition for passing budget 2020.

• (1905)

We have made it a condition every time a budget has been tabled since the 32 Bloc Québécois members have been in the House, going back to 2019. We have made this issue a condition. Regardless of what my Conservative colleagues may think, it is also one of the reasons we did not support the government on budgetary matters. We voted against the budgets because we had set conditions. It was not just that one. We had also set conditions regarding funding for oil and gas companies. We set a lot of other conditions for various budgets over the years, but this one was always among them.

Then, the pandemic happened. Assistance was announced for everyone, except seniors. Even though they were isolated, they had to continue to pay their bills, and they, too, were affected by what was known as the COVID-19 tax, the additional fees that started being charged. Many companies had to start charging delivery fees. Seniors were affected by the pandemic too, but the government did not announce any assistance for them. We had to come back to the House. I remember those somewhat strange times at the beginning of the pandemic when we came back to Parliament. There were not very many of us here. However, we came back to ask the government to provide assistance for seniors, who had not received any help. It was good that the government helped families and businesses, but it forgot about seniors, and we had to come back to the House. In the end, what the government proposed at the time was to give seniors the much-touted one-time cheque for \$300, or \$500 in the case of those who were receiving the GIS. That was a partial win for seniors. They did not get as much assistance as everyone else, but at least they got something because we had come back to the House to talk about it. However, the fact remains that it was just a one-time cheque.

Time went by and the pandemic wound down, but the government did not announce any other assistance measures for seniors. We raised the issue again and proposed increasing the OAS pension for all seniors aged 65 and up. In 2021, we once again included that in our list of conditions for supporting the budget. We then tabled a first petition in the House. What is interesting is that this is an inter-generational concern. It affects all generations. A young man in his 20s, Samuel Lévesque, had contacted me to say that he did not think this discrimination was fair. His grandparents had told him that their friends who were 75 and up were getting help, but that they were not. He understood the situation and he wondered what more he could do. He ended up starting a petition.

Then an election was called, but right before that, once again, one-time \$500 cheques were sent out to people aged 75 and over. Although this should have made people happy, I received emails from seniors who said they felt used and exploited. They said that these were purely vote-seeking cheques and that this one-time as-

sistance, which consisted of a single cheque, was not what they needed. What they needed was a complete overhaul of assistance measures for seniors.

That is why we, once again, made this a key issue in the election campaign. We proposed that assistance be provided to all seniors who receive the pension starting at age 65. In early 2022, we dedicated an opposition day in the House to this issue. The Bloc Québécois used one of its opposition days to discuss this topic, to say that the government had to reconsider its plan to increase OAS only for people aged 75 and over. In the end, in the summer of 2022, only seniors aged 75 and over received the 10% increase. We did not let up. Another petition was launched calling on the government to correct this unacceptable inequity. In 2023, we even held a symposium in Granby, where people from across Quebec and civil society organizations came to share their thoughts. Once again, it became clear that the growing economic inequalities among seniors needed to be addressed.

Then, last year, we came up with Bill C-319. It was introduced in March 2023, and the first hour of debate at second reading took place in May 2023. The last hour of second reading and the vote were held in the fall of 2023. I spent the entire month of August last year touring around. I went to Amqui, in the riding of my colleague from Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

• (1910)

I went to the riding of Beauport-Limoilou. I also went to meet the people of Thérèse-De Blainville and many others. Finally, we came back to the House after that tour motivated us to take action. The tour pushed us to move forward with this bill.

That was not the first time. To go back a bit, in 2021, I remember attending some of my colleagues' nomination meetings in the Abitibi-Témiscamingue region. There were some seniors chatting around a coffee shop. It was nice. They came to meet me and we talked. They said that we absolutely needed to eliminate this age discrimination. We also need to start removing barriers seniors face when they want to stay in the workforce. These two considerations are reflected in Bill C-319.

Last fall, we won a majority vote in the House. That is quite something. It was a majority vote in which I even managed to convince my Conservative colleagues that the extra 10% should also go to people aged 65 to 74. People who wanted to work should be able to earn a little more without having their guaranteed income supplement clawed back. So the bill had to increase from \$5,000 to \$6,500 the amount people could earn without having their GIS reduced.

Private Members' Business

We had that majority vote and referred the bill to the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. I appeared at committee for an hour. My colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville, who sat on the committee, questioned witnesses. Thanks to that hour of testimony I had with the witnesses and my colleague's work, which I would like to commend, we managed to get a unanimous report from the committee. Even government members recognized that this unacceptable inequity had to end.

I have given a bit of the background. I have talked about the bill. Third, just quickly, I would like to say that the sums requested for this initiative are neither exaggerated nor outrageous. We have presented a bill that is realistic and achievable. The famous figure of \$16 billion over five years amounts to barely \$3 billion a year. At that point, it is a question of political will. The money can be found. The government can give royal recommendation by the end of third reading and acknowledge that it has the money and is capable of investing in this bill.

This is about fairness for seniors. This is about aging with dignity. This is a baseline amount. This is what seniors start their retirement with. This is the universal amount. It is unfair that there are two classes of seniors. It is unfair to classify them as "young old" and "old old". It is not fair that these people are not on a level playing field when they retire. Of course, this is not going to solve everything. The Bloc Québécois would never claim that the bill before us is going to be a panacea and fix everything.

We hear all kinds of things. For example, we have heard that some people may not need it. Keep in mind that this is the taxable portion. The GIS is not taxable, but the OAS is. It means that people who need it less will spend a little more in their local economy and pay a little more in income tax. It gives them a little extra help. While \$80 a month will not make a huge difference, some people do need it.

We have to be careful. Fully 36% of seniors are living on the GIS and the OAS. That is nothing to sneeze at, and it would be wrong to say that every other senior has no need of the extra help. It is not true that people living above the poverty line, set at a meagre \$22,000 a year, are able to grow old with dignity. When a person is just above that line, they fall into a grey area where they have to wonder what help is available to them to cope with inflation.

Another factor we have to keep in mind is that seniors live on fixed incomes. These people do not see their pensions increase at the same rate as salaries, so that is problematic. Salaries are increasing much faster than retirees' fixed incomes. I want to point out that I have been touring ridings, including Liberal ridings, for two summers now. Before I even got a chance to speak, people were telling me that they went to see their MP to send a clear message that having two classes of seniors was unacceptable. I even went to Chicoutimi, to the riding of a Conservative Party member. Regardless of which party represents the riding, when I went to meet with seniors' groups, there was unanimous support for this bill. More than that, groups across Canada are writing to thank the Bloc Québécois for speaking up for seniors.

• (1915)

I will wrap up by saying that perhaps what these people are asking for is recognition that they are a grey force. They are tired of all the prejudice and, above all, they are tired of being seen as an economic burden. They want to be recognized as the grey power that they are.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, consistently, virtually from day one, the Government of Canada, in particular the Prime Minister, has been very supportive of seniors in all regions of Canada. One of its very first initiatives was the dramatic increase in the guaranteed income supplement, and I will have the opportunity to expand on that issue shortly, which literally took tens of thousands of seniors across the country out of poverty. The Bloc at the time voted against that measure.

I wonder if the member could provide her thoughts on the Bloc's perspective with respect to the importance of the GIS and contrast that, possibly, to the OAS.

• (1920)

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Speaker, that is an interesting question.

I would like to address two things.

Some say that the GIS is welfare for seniors. Personally, I do not like that, but it is a fact. Increasing the GIS helps only a few people. Those are not my words. Experts at the conference said that. We can make numbers say what we want, but there are some people who are just above the poverty line, who are not entitled to the GIS and who are not entitled to the 10% increase in OAS either because they are 67. The thing is, illness does not wait until 75, poverty does not wait until 75 and grocery bills cost the same whether we are 67 or 77.

As I explained, we voted against this because of the demands we made of the government in the budgets. We are not against the guaranteed income supplement. We can give it more thought later, but for now the main problem is that there is a disparity in the base amount of the program.

I invite the government to review this because unlike other programs the government tries to meddle in, OAS is its responsibility. It is one of the rare programs that is the federal government's responsibility. It is in charge of pensions, which fall under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech, and I want to acknowledge her passion for Bill C-319.

Private Members' Business

However, I am still concerned about the Bloc Québécois's October 29 deadline because I hear the Liberals, and they do not seem very open to it. They seem very calm, cool and collected. I have some concerns about the Bloc Québécois with respect to the Liberals.

Will the Liberals dangle a little carrot in front of them at the end of October? Will the Bloc Québécois take the bait and wait until the next budget? Or rather, are the Bloc Québécois members here in the House to get what they want on October 29, or else they will trigger an election?

I would like to be sure. Will the Bloc Québécois extend its deadline or will it really end this government on October 29?

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, which allows me to reiterate two points.

First, our request for a 10% increase for people aged 65 to 74 is not new. As the leader of the Bloc Québécois made clear, there is no room for compromise on this issue. We are going to hammer home the message. We do not want half-measures. We want 10% for people aged 65 to 74. That is our specific request. There can be no compromise.

I would like to extend an invitation to everyone, including my Conservative colleagues. If the Liberals deny our request and insist on going against the will of their own members as expressed in committee, they will have some explaining to do during the election. They will have to say why they made this choice, despite repeated requests, despite pressure from organizations on the ground, despite what we have heard, despite the testimonials from citizens that have piled up over the years as we have repeatedly made this request, and as the government stubbornly refuses to give this 10% increase to people aged 65 to 74. The Liberals will have to bear the brunt of this.

My Conservative colleagues supported Bill C-319. The bill has moved forward, and I invite them to continue—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni has time for a brief question.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, first, I want to thank my colleague from Shefford for putting forward this bill. It is such a great bill dealing with inequity.

We know that when Conservatives were in government, they raised the age of retirement from 65 to 67. They went after seniors. When the current government came forward with an increase, it wanted to create a two-tiered system, ignoring those between 65 and 74, so what did it do? It maintained the corporate tax rate the Conservatives had brought in for big corporations that are making record profits, such as big oil, big banks and big grocery.

Does my colleague believe there should be a tax increase on big corporations to make sure we can take care of our seniors in this country?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Speaker, one thing is certain: As we have always said, at this point, it is a political choice.

Some funds could be found elsewhere, and some funds could be better invested. I am just throwing that out there because I have to keep my answer short.

I would also like to know the Liberals' idea of retirement age. Is it 65 or 75? I asked them that in committee. What is your idea of retirement age? You boast about increasing it to 65, but by forcing seniors to get by without assistance. Sometimes you force them to stay in the labour market when their health prevents them from working, yet they feel they have no choice but to try to keep working to make ends meet.

What is retirement age in the Liberals' opinion?

• (1925)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the hon. member that she must address her comments to the Chair and not directly to the government.

Resuming debate.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and talk about an issue facing seniors. I can tell the member that Liberal members of Parliament have been very supportive of seniors in Canada through the years.

When I was first elected to Parliament, one of my colleagues had conducted a white paper on seniors in regard to how we could move forward as a political party. A number of years ago, I was sitting not far from where the member for Shefford is sitting today, when Stephen Harper was in Davos and made the decision to increase the age of retirement from 65 to 67.

To answer the question the hon. member has put to members of the Liberal caucus, I can assure her our response at the time was immediate. We understand and appreciate the retirement age of 65. The Prime Minister, when he was leader of the Liberal Party, made a very clear indication that we would restore the age of retirement back to 65. A number of months passed, and ultimately we were afforded the opportunity to form a government. One of the first actions of the Liberal government was to bring forward the change that reduced the age of retirement from 67 to 65.

Private Members' Business

We are also very aware of the issue of poverty, of having a fixed income with limited resources, and how we could help seniors living in poverty. Another initiative the government took up was to try to lift seniors out of poverty, which it did by making a dramatic increase to the guaranteed income supplement, the GIS. I believe seniors were going to receive an increase somewhere between \$800 and \$950 per year. That initiative alone literally lifted thousands of seniors out of poverty, including hundreds from my own constituency. As I pointed out, members of the Bloc voted against it. That is why I posed the specific question in regard to the GIS and how the Bloc voted back then. I think it is a valid question.

How do we maximize tax dollars to support our seniors? I believe it was a good decision back then to dramatically increase the guaranteed income supplement, and the numbers clearly show that we were right.

The member asked about the age of retirement being 65. As I say, we reduced it from 67 back to 65, and then we also went to work negotiating with provinces to deal with the CPP. Those in the workforce contribute in a very significant way, as all members of society, whether they are working or not, will ultimately contribute. We put an emphasis on increasing the CPP. To do that, unlike the previous government, we had to work it through a number of the provinces and build the support to do so. We were successful in doing that. A lot more people will be retiring in the coming years, and they will have better retirement savings as a direct result of actions we took nine years ago. That is another initiative the government has taken.

• (1930)

Going back to the fixed income issue, during the pandemic, as has been pointed out, there was a need to provide extra support for seniors. Liberal members of Parliament and others were hearing in their constituencies about the different types of benefits. We came out with all sorts of programs, but we came out with something separate and unique for seniors. We gave two amounts. One was for OAS and an additional amount was for seniors who were collecting GIS, in recognition of the issue of their finances. That was during the pandemic.

Then the election followed and the Liberal Party of Canada made it very clear, which we heard through representations in many different forms, that as people age, they often require additional needs, such as medical assistance. They may be more fragile, on average, as they age. Their savings may dwindle over time or their ability to earn additional income might be diminished, so the Liberal Party of Canada made an election platform commitment to deal with the three specific factors I just raised. We said we would increase, for those 75 and over, the OAS by 10% because of what I just indicated. Canadians were very much aware of it. Seniors were aware of it. We won the election and fulfilled that election commitment.

There have been huge investments to support seniors. For the dental program, the first people who were eligible to receive the dental benefit were seniors, and seniors in all regions of the country took advantage of that program, as they should. That was the purpose of the program, contrary to what members opposite might say. One of the biggest factors in developing the dental program was seniors, but the pharmacare program was also important. When we

think of diabetes and the costs related to it, seniors will benefit from that.

As a government, we have made tangible commitments to deal with long-term health care facilities, and we are working with different levels of government to improve those conditions. We have made investments in housing to both non-profit agencies and different levels of government. We have come up with enhanced financing for support programs such as the New Horizons for Seniors and other organizations that support seniors.

The bottom line is that, from day one until today and going forward, I can assure members of the Bloc, Canadians and others that the government is very much in tune with the needs of seniors, and we will continue to look at ways to support them. That is the way we started, and I can assure the members opposite that we will continue that going forward.

• (1935)

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a privilege to rise on behalf of the residents of Kelowna—Lake Country. Today I am here to speak to Bill C-319, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act. I have spoken on this issue in the past and appreciate the opportunity to do so again.

Our seniors deserve respect. Seniors have raised families, teaching their beliefs and values; founded businesses, employing people; taught and taken care of people; volunteered; built our country; and served our country, fighting for the freedoms we have today. Time and time again, I am told remarkable stories by seniors in Kelowna—Lake Country. There are few areas of life not touched positively by our seniors. It is clear that Kelowna—Lake Country, and really all of Canada, would not be the same without the hard work of seniors and all they have contributed over their lives and still do.

Seniors are mentors and leaders in our communities. That is why it is so unacceptable that seniors are facing the challenges they currently are. I have talked to many seniors who are very stressed and concerned. The cost of living has ballooned after nine years of the Liberal Prime Minister, causing seniors to struggle like never before just to pay for basic necessities.

Seniors in my community have reached out about how they are struggling to pay their heating bill. Many have sent me pictures of their heating bill, which includes the carbon tax. The minimum amount for the tax is set by the federal government, and the government is increasing it every year to be on track to increase it to 61¢ per litre.

Local seniors have also commented on how GST is being charged on top of the home heating carbon tax, which is a tax on a tax. This is wrong. A resident, Grant, wrote to me about his heating bill and all the taxes. He said that he used \$50.18 worth of gas, yet owed \$316.65. He then went on to say that he has worked since he was 12 years old, non-stop, and has paid his fair share of taxes.

Private Members' Business

I have talked to retirees who have had to go back to work and who feel sad that they cannot spend as much time volunteering or cannot donate as much to their favourite charities as they used to. I hear from seniors who are afraid to walk around their own neighbourhood that they have lived in for many years due to crime and concerns over their safety. I have talked to many seniors who are worried about their adult children making their mortgage payment and about their grandchildren who will have a tough time ever owning their own home.

Seniors have reached out to me who were just about to retire, and because of the Liberal capital gains tax increases, they have told me they will have to work longer. Seniors who are looking to retire on modest savings are finding that this is no longer possible in Canada, especially with the new Liberal tax changes. It is untenable that seniors are finding themselves priced out of the country they have built.

Here is the situation of many seniors: They worked their whole life providing for their family and contributing to this country. They have contributed economically through their job and through creating businesses. They have raised a family and volunteered in their community. They have contributed by being a good citizen by following the rules. They have saved for their retirement. However, now the golden years for many have melted away. This is not the reality that seniors deserve, yet it is the one that many of them face due to the Liberal Prime Minister and his partners in the NDP, the costly government.

Many seniors in my community struggle to make ends meet, and many are forced to choose between paying for necessities such as food and medication. One senior reached out to me and said that there is absolutely no hope for those on fixed and low income as they are being taxed to death, literally. The senior went on to say that every time they go to the grocery store, prices are going up. A senior couple from Kelowna—Lake Country reached out to me to say that living on their pensions is becoming harder and harder all the time.

• (1940)

This is a result of the reckless, inflationary spending of the Liberal Prime Minister, who is propped up by his partners in the NDP and, now, apparently also the Bloc.

Liberal policies have led to record inflation, with millions of Canadians now struggling to simply keep their heads above water. The standard of living continues to drop in Canada, which has experienced the worst decline in per-person income out of all the G7 countries over the last five years. Seniors on a fixed income are uniquely at risk from inflation, as fixed incomes are unable to keep up with the cost of living, which keeps growing because of all the increased spending.

It is not just in my own community that seniors are struggling, but across Canada. According to the Salvation Army, 75% of Canadians currently face challenges managing limited financial resources. Moreover, 25% of Canadians continue to be extremely concerned about having enough income to cover their basic needs, such as food and shelter. Not all seniors have paid off their mortgages, and this has led to even more stresses. The Bank of Canada recently confirmed that Canadians will see a steep jump in pay-

ments as millions of Canadians renew their mortgages over the next two years. This is just one more area in which seniors, especially those on fixed incomes, are struggling.

This legislation provides equity for all seniors, ensuring that old age security is available to those between 65 and 74 years old. Seniors aged 65 to 74 should not be treated differently than seniors 75 or older, something that has occurred under the Liberal government. As such, Conservatives support this measure as part of the legislation.

The legislation also serves to safeguard seniors from potential clawbacks within the guaranteed income supplement. It seeks to increase the exemption amount for employment income that is taken into account for eligibility. Increasing the GIS earnings exemption would minimize some of the clawbacks seniors may experience. Seniors should be able to continue to work or go back to work, if they choose to and are able to, without the loss of federal retirement GIS. Especially considering that rising inflation has had a disproportionate impact on seniors, they should not be penalized for working if they choose to and want to.

To be clear, however, I must say that the legislation will not fix the cost of living crisis or the devastating situation caused by the Liberal government. Conservatives will continue to focus on fixing the budget to get the government spending under control, as well as axing the tax and stopping the tax increases during this unprecedented cost of living crisis, which has affected seniors in my community and communities across the country.

In stopping the broken policies of the Liberals, along with their NDP and Bloc partners, common-sense Conservatives will bring back the promise of Canada: If one works hard, one should be able to get ahead and live and retire in a safe community.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise to speak to Bill C-319, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act. I want to thank the sponsor, my colleague from Shefford for moving this bill.

The bill before us today is about increasing old age security by 10% for those who are between the ages of 65 and 74. These people were initially excluded by the Liberal government when the government decided to increase the OAS for seniors. The government decided to create a two-tiered system of seniors, those who were over 75 and those who were under 75. Those aged between 65 and 74 were going to be penalized and not get the increase. This is similar to what the Conservatives did when they raised the retirement age from 65 to 67.

We are seeing a pattern of both Liberals and Conservatives wanting seniors to work longer, and this was no different. Seniors deserve better. Many seniors across the country do not have the resources to deal with the high cost of housing and the increase in inflation, especially those who are on fixed incomes. They are the ones bearing the brunt of this. I would argue that seniors and people living with disabilities are feeling the pinch the most.

Increasing the exemption for income from employment or self-employment is also important in the calculation of the guaranteed income supplement, from \$5,000 to \$6,500, which is also incorporated into this bill. We want to make sure seniors who do wish to participate in the workforce are not being penalized. We know we need to do more, which is why the NDP put forward a dental care plan and a plan for pharmacare, so seniors are not making the choice of whether they are going to buy food or take the medicine they need.

We are going to continue to work on ideas to help lift seniors out of poverty and ensure they have the best retirement possible, and a retirement with dignity.

In 2021, when the Liberals brought in the 10% bonus for seniors 75 and over, they decided to leave some seniors out, and they created those two categories I discussed earlier.

I am hoping we can move this bill forward quickly. This is a minority Parliament. To make this minority Parliament work, this is clearly a really important aspect of that.

I also want to speak about the cost of this. I have raised this in the House of Commons many times since the Liberals brought in this two-tiered benefit for seniors and neglected those who were over 65 and under 74. I have raised this also at the government operations committee, where I have asked the former president of the Treasury Board and the current President of the Treasury Board to re-examine this. I helped her break down the numbers, because we know that she knows we have the lowest corporate taxes in the G7. That was something the Harper government did. It did not do that for small business. It lowered corporate taxes by 5%. We have seen corporate taxes drop from 28% to 15%, from the Chrétien era to today.

The Liberals have maintained that low corporate tax rate while oil and gas, big grocery and big banks have had record profits.

The Liberals have also failed to tackle the issue around tax havens. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, in 2019, calculated that between \$21 billion and \$26 billion a year was being lost to tax havens. The ultrarich get these tax benefits, but seniors who are trying to retire with dignity are being targeted.

In 2021, it was projected that \$31 billion was leaking from the Canadian economy so the ultrarich and CEOs could get off the hook again while seniors struggled to make ends meet. What did the government do? It hired more people at CRA, but the people at CRA are focusing on small business people, on people struggling to make ends meet and seniors. Seniors in my riding have come to me and told me that the government is coming after them for small amounts of money, when in fact the government could have hired auditors at CRA to target those who are manoeuvring around the tax system to benefit themselves, the super rich and these big corporations. Instead, the government is focused on everyday people, and that needs to change.

• (1945)

This is an excellent bill and an excellent start. I have some ideas on how we can cover it because it is projected to cost \$3 billion. Back in 2015, the PBO projected that a 1% increase in corporate

Private Members' Business

tax would be about \$2.6 billion. I would argue that that would be around the same amount today. Therefore, a 1% increase in corporate tax would cover the costs of taking care of our seniors. What will the government do? We know the Liberals and the Conservatives. They are always going to be there for the big corporations and their friends and are not going to do that.

The NDP was able to apply pressure to increase the excess profit tax on the big banks. That was a 15% tax on profits of over a billion dollars. That generated billions of dollars, that windfall tax. The PBO did an analysis of the government applying that tax to big oil and gas, which would generate a profit of \$4.2 billion.

We know that Conservatives in the U.K. charge an excess profit tax, a windfall tax, on oil and gas. We cannot even get the Liberals to do that in Canada. The oil oligarchy here is always arguing in the House of Commons about who can build more pipelines between the two of them. I can tell members that they are both good at building pipelines, but they are not good at tackling climate change. They are also not good at taking care of seniors. We know that right across the country. We are seeing that constantly. Therefore, I urge the government to look at an excess profit tax, at closing tax loopholes for the super-rich and for tax havens, and at possibly increasing the corporate tax rate. It should not be like this for seniors.

I got an email from Janice from my riding. She writes:

I must ask, why is it seniors collecting cpp and old age pensions receive less than CERB?

The federal government stated they felt \$2000.00/month a livable wage yet many seniors are receiving substantially less.

Many seniors are living silently in poverty. Are there any plans to address this shameful situation?

She wrote about being excluded from the OAS increase.

Today, with the bill put forward by my colleague from Winnipeg Centre, we had the opportunity for an annual basic income. The Liberals and Conservatives could have got behind that bill. They could have, at committee, prioritized people living with disabilities and seniors, the most vulnerable in our society, but they chose not to. It would have made sense.

Private Members' Business

When I ask people in my communities whether they think we should continue the corporate welfare that is happening with tax havens, with the lowest corporate tax rate in the G7, with the continued focus of CRA audits on everyday people while the big players get off the hook, and with preferential tax rates for CEOs. Everybody who I have talked to in my riding believes that we should be prioritizing taking care of our seniors and those living with disabilities. A guaranteed livable income could have done that, but the Liberals chose not to do that.

We are going to continue to come here to the House to bring forward good ideas.

I am really grateful to the Bloc for bringing forward this initiative. I do appreciate my colleague using her spot in the order of precedence to move the bill. We will be supporting this bill wholeheartedly. I hope everybody in the House does, and that we can move it quickly, because people are struggling right now. Seniors are struggling with how they are going to pay their rent, buy food and get their medicine. I am glad we are able to take some pressure off of them with dental care, but we know that, with the rising cost of inflation, they cannot keep up with it. Therefore, I hope we can move this rapidly along here today, and in the weeks ahead.

I want to thank my colleague one last time for moving the bill.

• (1950)

[Translation]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, with the little time I have, my first words will be for my colleague from Shefford. I am proud of her, just as I am proud to be a member of the Bloc Québécois, which has been calling for fairness for seniors since 2019. The main takeaway from Bill C-319 is that it is about two things: fairness and dignity.

Why is it about fairness? My colleagues have talked about this. Old age security is a universal plan that applies to people aged 65 and over and falls under federal jurisdiction. By discriminating, as the government has done, on the basis of age—that is, by increasing the pension for those aged 75 and over—it has turned its back on people aged 65 to 74, even though they are part of the universal program. This is an infringement. In labour relations, we would call this an “orphan clause” or a clause that discriminates on the basis of age. That would be unacceptable, yet that is what the government did. The government can correct this inequity. This is an infringement that needs to be corrected.

We heard from witnesses in committee. We are talking about millions of people who are affected and what we need to keep in mind is that 30% to 40% of them live only from old age pensions. I will give an example. When it comes to the Fédération de l'âge d'or du Québec, or FADOQ, and the Association québécoise de défense des droits des personnes retraitées et préretraitées, or AQDR, half their members, including 39% of Quebecers, live on an income of roughly \$21,000 or \$22,000. That is what they get from OAS and GIS. It is unacceptable.

It is true that seniors groups are not homogenous, but there is no more homogeneity among seniors 65 to 74 than there is among those 75 and up. We need something universal. People who retire at 65 need an equal and fair OAS increase. Not increasing it is totally

unacceptable. That is why we are calling on the Liberal government to correct this injustice, to work on giving seniors dignity. We had support in committee and we will have support in the House.

We are being told it will cost \$3 billion, but is that an expense or an investment? When people are left in a vulnerable or precarious situation, their whole standard of living is negatively affected. Financial insecurity is a form of isolation. One witness told us that a person who earns \$21,000, \$22,000 or \$23,000 will come up with excuses not to go when they get invited to the movies because they do not have any discretionary income. That is the situation. If we want people between the ages of 65 and 74 to be healthy, then we need to make sure that they have a decent quality of life, which will also help them when they are aged 75 and over. As the Conservatives would say, that is common sense.

The Government of Canada does not have very many social programs. Employment insurance and old age security were created to protect vulnerable people. In committee, I heard government members saying that seniors aged 65 to 74 do not need this assistance. There is something really shameful about comments like that. This could make a big difference for people who are living on a fixed income, given the cost of housing, groceries and health care.

• (1955)

We cannot forget about women. A majority of these people live alone and are women. It is no coincidence that those over the age of 65, our generation, are in this situation. Often, women have chosen to stay at home. They have had odd jobs. They did not contribute much to the Quebec Pension Plan, or QPP, or could not afford a private pension plan. Maybe there was no group plan. Essentially, the system has made their situation even more precarious.

The AQDR rightly reminded us that in 1927, when old age security was introduced, it was seen as a major step forward. We were seen as an example. Now, we rank 13th among OECD countries in this area.

Increasing the baseline level of OAS—we are not talking about the GIS here—from the age of 65 will permanently benefit these people who have contributed so much to society.

• (2000)

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

FINANCE

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, tonight, I have a chance to revisit an exchange I had in question period at the end of May. Sadly, it was an exchange about the economy. Things have not gotten any better since May here in Canada, and we find ourselves dealing with a continuing economic crisis brought on by the policies of the Liberal government following, of course, the failed Trudeau economic plan of the seventies and eighties. Now, in successive Liberal governments led by that family, we have run 24 deficits in 25 years and had a constant stream of crises: housing crises, energy crises, unity crises and the like.

My question back then was about how the most incompetent, reckless government in Canadian history was undertaking radical experiments with objectively terrible results. Of course, it has been supported by the NDP and now the Bloc. Back then I referenced an RBC report that talked about “a slow bleed over the last 2 years [that] left per-capita output back at 2016 levels”, and I asked about that falling per-person income in Canada.

The response from the parliamentary secretary at the time was kind of interesting. He did not defend the government, talk about the successes that the government had or refute any of my claims. He took issue with the fact that I would use GDP per capita, or growth per capita, as a measure. He said it was “not a particularly useful one, as most economists will say.” Therefore, I did a bit of digging.

This was not very hard, actually, to find on the Statistics Canada website, so I am not sure whether the Liberal government is anti-Statistics Canada right now. However, this year, Statistics Canada had this to say: “Slower economic growth over the past year and near-record population increases fuelled by temporary and permanent immigration have put the spotlight on recent trends in Canada’s gross domestic product...per capita.” It went on to say, “Recent reports...have all stressed the trend towards weaker per capita growth, highlighting its negative implications for living standards and wage growth.”

This Statistics Canada document quotes information that the parliamentary secretary, on behalf of the government, says is not credible or supported by economists. A little later in the same document, Statistics Canada said, “GDP per capita is widely used to gauge differences in living standards across countries. Higher levels of per capita output are generally found in more developed economies with advanced infrastructure, better health care and education systems, and higher levels of access to technologies and innovation.”

As such, whichever parliamentary secretary is going to answer the question today, I would like them to correct the record if they could or clarify the Liberal position on whether rapidly declining GDP per capita is bad. My assertion is that it is bad for Canada. The parliamentary secretary said it was not necessarily bad. More importantly, I want to hear something about a plan. We have four

Adjournment Proceedings

minutes right now; I hope we will hear something about a plan, moving forward, to reverse the economic devastation being inflicted on our country by the Liberal, NDP and now Bloc coalition.

● (2005)

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.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for this opportunity to defend our government’s responsible economic plan, which has left Canada in an enviable fiscal position. Let me begin by stating some facts.

Canada’s net debt-to-GDP ratio is well below that of our G7 peers, and we are one of only two G7 countries rated AAA by at least two of the three major global rating agencies. This has been achieved through our government’s responsible economic plan. It has enabled proactive investments to support Canadians and Canada’s long-term prosperity, which will have a direct and lasting impact for future generations.

In budget 2024, we provided an economic plan that makes generational investments by raising revenues through an increased capital gains inclusion rate. This will make life cost less for Canadians while making our tax system fairer for everyone.

Transformative investments in clean energy, in opportunities for workers, in innovation and to improve housing affordability will support a business environment that gives investors confidence that Canada’s workforce is ready for more opportunities. This will enable our economy to attract more investment and will create more jobs.

Budget 2024 also supports fairness for every generation by sticking to the fiscal objectives laid out in the fall economic statement, setting deficits and the federal debt burden on a downward track. Moving forward, we are committed to keeping deficits below 1% of GDP beginning in 2026-27 and in future years.

[Translation]

Since the April budget, Canada’s economic indicators have also remained positive. Canada was the first G7 country to lower its interest rates and to do so three times. This is good news for homeowners with mortgages up for renewal, as well as for first-time homebuyers. It is also good for businesses.

Adjournment Proceedings

Canada's inflation rate dropped to 2% in August, marking eight consecutive months of decline and the lowest inflation rate since February 2021. In addition, Canadian workers are earning more on average than they were before the pandemic, even after accounting for inflation.

Overall, the Canadian economy, under our government's leadership, is strong and resilient. For Canadians, this means more jobs and better wages. Our government's fiscally responsible economic plan is delivering an economy that works for everyone.

[*English*]

Hon. Mike Lake: Madam Speaker, the hon. parliamentary secretary talked about the enviable position we have in Canada. She touted good news for property owners renewing their mortgages. However, because of the policies of the Liberal government, a Canadian renewing, say, a five-year fixed-term mortgage in September today versus someone who had a mortgage in September 2019 could be paying between \$500 and \$1,000 more in monthly mortgage payments for the same house. That is for an average house in Canada, depending on where someone lives. I do not know that this is good news for anybody, and it is in a context of record food bank usage and unemployment that is 1% higher than it was five years ago at the same time.

I would love the hon. member to explain how that is good news for people renewing their mortgages.

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise in this House tonight to speak about our good economic financial plan.

From universal public health care to employment insurance to strong, stable, funded pensions like the Canada pension plan, there has always been an agreement that we will take care of our neighbours when they have the need. It gives our workers stability and our businesses confidence that the right supports are in place to keep our economy fair, keep people healthy and keep the middle class strong.

[*Translation*]

With budget 2024, our government is renewing its commitment to that goal by unlocking the door to the middle class for millions of young Canadians in a fiscally responsible way.

Later this year, the government will unveil its fall economic statement, delivering the next phase of an economic plan to build more homes, make life more affordable and continue to invest in Canada's clean, growing economy.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.): Madam Speaker, on April 29, 2024, I asked the immigration minister to explain to Canadians why an individual convicted five times of criminal charges facing a deportation order upheld by a Federal Court managed to get ministerial intervention to stop his removal. Ministerial interventions are for serious, extreme circumstances, often life-and-death situations. I asked the minister if it was his intention to make a mockery of our legal and immigration systems, or if his intervention was guided by a political calculation to get more votes for his

party. Regrettably, the minister responded by stating that these are not matters that we talk about publicly, much less on the floor of the House of Commons.

Given the total mess of the immigration system under the government's watch, I do not blame the minister for not wanting to talk about it. For the record, the minister was not asked to divulge protected, private information. I was asking him why he personally intervened in such a clear case of deportation, as it was upheld by his own department and the courts.

It is worth giving the background on this case as there are important questions that any reasonable Canadian would ask as to why that particular deportation was not carried out. First and foremost, why did a five-time convicted person receive preferential treatment? What warranted special consideration by the minister to personally overrule not only his own department but also the Federal Court?

I have constituents who have been waiting almost three years for family sponsorship and others with loved ones who have been waiting over a year for visitor visas, but a person with five convictions who blocked the building of national pipeline infrastructure, someone who was sentenced to two weeks of imprisonment for criminal contempt of court, who has also served time for blocking the main road to Vancouver's international airport warranted the minister's special attention and his personal intervention. Is there something Canadians do not know about that person which made him so special to the minister that he was willing to throw out the rule of law and the integrity of our immigration system?

At a time when Canada is still struggling to deal with the full scope of foreign interference in our country, the minister personally intervened to stop the deportation of a five-time convicted person who boasted about having \$170,000 U.S. in foreign money to fund illegal blockades of roads, bridges and highways in B.C.'s Lower Mainland. At a time when the immigration system is leaking like a sieve, where literal terrorists are being granted citizenship after taking part in ISIS terror videos dismembering the bodies of people who were murdered, that was what the minister thought deserved his intervention. What was the criteria? Thousands upon thousands of applicants would love to know. Is there a new Liberal two-tier immigration policy? Does the new Liberal policy have a limit on how many criminal convictions is too many? Clearly, five criminal convictions were not a problem for the minister.

It is no wonder that the government has been such a doormat for foreign interference when people who boast about being foreign funded as they block key roads, bridges and other infrastructure are saved from deportation. Therefore, I am going to ask my question again. Now that the parliamentary secretary understands what I am asking, was the minister's intervention intended to make a mockery of our legal and immigration systems or was his intervention politically motivated to get a few more votes?

• (2010)

Mr. Paul Chiang (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for raising this important issue. In general, applications are assessed on a case-by-case basis. Decisions are made by highly trained officers who carefully and systematically assess each application against the criteria set out in the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, or IRPA, and its regulations.

IRPA sets out the core principles and concepts that govern Canada's immigration and refugee protection program, including provisions relating to refugees, sponsorships and removals, detention reviews and admissibility hearings, and the jurisdiction and powers of tribunals. A decision to remove someone from Canada is not taken lightly.

I would like to add that IRPA authorizes designated officers to issue temporary resident permits, or TRPs, to inadmissible foreign nationals when it is justified in certain circumstances. A TRP allows the holder either to enter Canada or to remain in Canada during the validity period of the TRP. A TRP provides the foreign national temporary resident status in Canada. If the TRP is valid for at least six months, the foreign national may apply for a work or study permit. Upon cancellation or expiration of the TRP, the foreign national must leave Canada.

TRPs allow officers to balance the objectives of the IRPA to meet Canada's social, humanitarian and economic commitments while maintaining the health and security of Canadians. Clear records of decisions allow for the monitoring and research necessary for the preparation of the annual report to Parliament. The number of TRPs issued is included in the annual report, and they are categorized according to the grounds of inadmissibility.

I would like to point out that, under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, a foreign national who, in the opinion of an officer, is inadmissible or does not meet the requirement of this act becomes a temporary resident if an officer is of the opinion that it is justified in the circumstances and issues a temporary resident permit, which may be cancelled at any time.

The Minister of Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship is authorized by legislation to exempt foreign nationals, including those who may be under a deportation order, from any applicable criteria or obligation of the act, where he deems it is justified on humanitarian and compassionate considerations. The minister takes this authority very seriously, as well as his responsibility as minister to ensure that he is executing his duties in a fair and objective manner.

Due to privacy reasons, I will not speak on any individual cases. However, I assure members that he assesses each case brought to his attention to ensure that he exercises his authority in the best in-

terest of Canada, Canadians and the people who use our immigration system. I hope this is helpful.

• (2015)

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary said three key words: "highly trained officers". Why were the highly trained officers overruled by the minister? I am not asking for specific case details. What I am asking for is the criteria that led the minister to intervene in the case of an individual who was convicted five times by Canada's courts. Not only did the minister override the highly trained officers in his own department, he also overrode Canada's courts.

Frankly, it must take a lot of deep thought to overrule one's own department and ignore the findings of the court. I ask the parliamentary secretary why because, frankly, I really need something to tell my constituents who are not getting special treatment from the Minister of Immigration.

Mr. Paul Chiang: Madam Speaker, generally speaking, all of the cases processed by IRCC are assessed individually. Decisions are made by highly trained officers who carefully and systematically assess each application against the criteria set out in the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, or IRPA, and its regulations.

The Minister of Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship is authorized by legislation to exempt foreign nationals, including those who may be under a deportation order, from any applicable criteria or obligations of the act where he deems it justified on humanitarian and compassionate consideration. The minister takes this authority very seriously, as well as his responsibility as minister, to ensure that he is executing his duties in a fair and objective manner. Due to privacy reasons, I will—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up.

The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

HEALTH

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have now lost 47,162 people to a poisoned drug supply. That is between January 2016 and May 2024. That is more people than we lost in World War II, yet we are not seeing a war-type effort to save lives in this country and to fight this crisis.

We have heard from the experts: the First Nations Health Authority; the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police; the chief medical health officers of both British Columbia and Ontario; the chief coroners of Alberta, B.C. and Ontario, the provinces where the highest number of deaths are happening; the Canadian Expert Task Force on Substance Use, which was made up of a wide spectrum, including law enforcement; Moms Stop The Harm; and the Canadian Mental Health Association.

Adjournment Proceedings

They have been consistent and unanimous in saying we need to stop criminalizing people who use substances; we need to replace the toxic street supply with a safer supply of drug replacement therapy; we need to have treatment on demand, no-wait treatment and no-wait stabilization beds, so when people want help, they get help; and we need to invest heavily in recovery and prevention focused on our youth and, of course, in enforcement, so law enforcement can go after the manufacturers of the substances and those trafficking, especially those at the high levels. Most importantly, all of them have said we need to treat this crisis like the emergency it is.

The government has spent less than 1% responding to this crisis than it did on COVID-19. Why? It is because of stigma. We know who is dying. It is mainly men. Those living in my home province are 5.9 times more likely to die if they are first nations; in Alberta, it is eight times higher. The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council, in my riding, just declared a state of emergency. It is losing so many members. The Ahousaht First Nation has lost over 100 members because of the mental health and substance use crisis just in the last few years. I know many of them. It is very painful to see what is happening. Also, the big-city mayors have been calling for help. They are saying that not enough resources are being applied to respond to this.

We have seen countries do this. Portugal saw a 77% drop in chronic daily users because it got the politicians out of the way. That is what we need to do. We need to support the experts with evidence-based policy and provide the resources. The government put forward its drug strategy, and it is great. It uses the same language we see in Portugal, a compassionate, coordinated, integrated plan, but guess what it is missing. There is no timeline, and there are no resources, regarding how it is going to respond to the crisis.

The government had an auto theft summit. I am not saying that is not an important issue, but it has still not had a summit on the toxic drug crisis. In the substance use assistance program on Vancouver Island, only one riding, Victoria, got funding. Everybody else was shut out. There are first nations that needed that money. Greater Waterloo region, as my colleague was saying, got nothing.

We need action. We need the government to treat this with the war effort that it requires. Nobody is not feeling this right now. No community is being left. This is what I would call an emergency, and the government is not treating it like that.

• (2020)

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.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni for his strong advocacy on the matter.

The overdose crisis is one of the most serious and unprecedented public health threats in Canada's recent history. It is driven by the increasingly toxic and ever-changing illegal drug supply. We are committed to examining all tools at our disposal, and evidence, to respond to the tragic increase in overdoses and to help save lives, while supporting a balance between public health and public safety.

We know that a comprehensive approach is needed to address the crisis. This includes efforts across the continuum of care to prevent

drug use, reduce harms and support people in accessing treatment and recovery services, as well as enforcement efforts to maintain public safety. It also includes ensuring that people have access to critical supports such as housing.

The government of Canada has invested almost \$200 billion over 10 years to support provinces and territories to deliver services, in addition to the \$1 billion we have directly invested to address the crisis. Regarding the member's question, the minister has been clear: Officials are working to reconstitute the expert task force so our response can be driven by evidence, not by ideology.

The government remains committed to addressing substance use and addiction as a health issue and not a criminal one. People struggling with addiction are not criminals. They need health care, not to be in jail. We changed the legislation and issued guidance to make sure that in cases of simple possession, police and prosecutors must now consider referring the person to health and social services, issuing a warning or taking no further action. As a result, they can consider both public health and public safety.

We know that we cannot act alone. All partners must work together to make health and social services available and accessible so people can be diverted from the criminal justice system into health care. As with any policy, these efforts must be made with a comprehensive plan for implementation. An exemption can be one piece of the puzzle, but we know that the changes need to be complemented by a range of other actions to have their intended impact.

We will continue working in partnership with all provinces, territories, municipalities, indigenous communities and experts to determine the best ways to support the health and well-being of people who use substances. We remain committed to taking a public health approach to the crisis and keeping everyone in our communities safe.

• (2025)

Mr. Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, I am urgently calling on the government to treat this as a wartime-like effort and to come up with a plan with resources and a timeline.

The Liberals have spent less than 1% of what they did during COVID in responding to the crisis. They keep saying jurisdiction is a barrier, but they found a way through it during COVID. They need to listen to local communities and indigenous peoples on how to work through it. We need to get politicians out of the way. Let experts lead with evidence-based policy. We need to debunk and fight back against the Conservative disinformation, and the Liberals need to stop the incrementalism.

This is an emergency. Here, it is just me and you, Madam Speaker, and the parliamentary secretary, again, at the end of the night. I will keep bringing them back here until the government responds. People are dying on our streets.

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Madam Speaker, as I said, we are committed to addressing substance use and addiction as a public health issue, while protecting public safety. There is no one-size-fits-all solution. We must keep working together to save lives, reduce harms and help people access the health care services they need, when and where they need them.

Adjournment Proceedings

We will continue working with provinces, territories, municipalities, indigenous communities and experts to determine the best ways to support the health and well-being of people who use drugs. This includes working with partners to divert people from the criminal justice system into the health care system, and making health and social supports more available and accessible.

Our commitment to addressing the crisis is unwavering, and we will continue to consider all options.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8:28 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 25, 2024

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS			
Maskwa Aquatic Club		Mr. Trudeau.....	25845
Ms. Diab.....	25841		
Rail Safety Week		Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Lawrence.....	25841	Mr. Poilievre.....	25845
Asthma Canada		Mr. Trudeau.....	25846
Mr. Oliphant.....	25841	Mr. Poilievre.....	25846
Association des libraires du Québec Award of Excellence		Mr. Trudeau.....	25846
Mr. Simard.....	25842	Mr. Poilievre.....	25846
La Festa Degli Anziani		Mr. Trudeau.....	25846
Ms. Lattanzio.....	25842	Government Priorities	
Niagara West		Mr. Blanchet.....	25846
Mr. Allison.....	25842	Mr. Trudeau.....	25846
Dennis Smith		Mr. Blanchet.....	25846
Mr. Scarpaleggia.....	25842	Mr. Trudeau.....	25846
Franco-Ontarian Day		Health	
Mrs. Lalonde.....	25843	Mr. Singh.....	25846
Bloc Québécois		Mr. Trudeau.....	25847
Mr. Gourde.....	25843	Mr. Singh.....	25847
Genwell		Mr. Trudeau.....	25847
Mr. Turnbull.....	25843	Carbon Pricing	
Public Safety		Mr. Poilievre.....	25847
Ms. Dancho.....	25843	Mr. Trudeau.....	25847
Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada		Mr. Poilievre.....	25847
Mr. Caputo.....	25843	Mr. Trudeau.....	25847
Southlake Seniors Club		Mr. Poilievre.....	25848
Mr. Ali.....	25844	Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
Guaranteed Livable Basic Income		Mr. Poilievre.....	25848
Ms. Gazan.....	25844	Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
Réjean Parent		Mr. Poilievre.....	25848
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	25844	Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada		Mr. Poilievre.....	25848
Mr. Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake).....	25844	Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
World Alzheimer's Month		Mr. Poilievre.....	25848
Ms. Vandenberg.....	25845	Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
		Intergovernmental Relations	
		Mr. Blanchet.....	25848
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25848
		Government Priorities	
		Mr. Blanchet.....	25849
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25849
		The Economy	
		Mr. Poilievre.....	25849
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25849
		Mr. Poilievre.....	25849
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25849
		Mr. Poilievre.....	25849
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25849
		Mr. Poilievre.....	25850
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25850
		Health	
		Ms. Ildout.....	25850
		Mr. Trudeau.....	25850
The Economy			
Mr. Poilievre.....	25845		
Mr. Trudeau.....	25845		
Housing			
Mr. Poilievre.....	25845		

Seniors	
Ms. Mathyssen	25851
Mr. Trudeau	25851
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Hanley	25851
Mr. Trudeau	25851
International Trade	
Mr. Poilievre	25851
Mr. Trudeau	25851
Mr. Poilievre	25851
Mr. Trudeau	25851
Mr. Poilievre	25851
Mr. Trudeau	25852
Mr. Poilievre	25852
Mr. Trudeau	25852
Government Priorities	
Mr. Blanchet	25852
Mr. Trudeau	25852
Mr. Blanchet	25852
Mr. Trudeau	25852
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	25852
Mr. Trudeau	25852
Mr. Poilievre	25853
Mr. Trudeau	25853
The Environment	
Mr. Poilievre	25853
Mr. Trudeau	25853
Women and Gender Equality	
Ms. Kayabaga	25853
Mr. Trudeau	25853
Public Safety	
Mr. Poilievre	25853
Mr. Trudeau	25853
Mr. Poilievre	25853
Mr. Trudeau	25854
Mr. Poilievre	25854
Mr. Trudeau	25854
Taxation	
Mr. Bains	25854
Mr. Trudeau	25854
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Desjarlais	25854
Mr. Trudeau	25854
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	25854
Mr. Trudeau	25854
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Mr. Desjarlais	25855

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government

Motion	25855
Motion negated	25856

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Framework for a Guaranteed Livable Basic Income Act

Bill C-223. Second reading	25856
Motion negated	25858

National Strategy to Reduce Food Waste and Combat Food Insecurity

Motion	25858
Motion agreed to	25859

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-378. Second reading	25859
Motion agreed to	25860
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	25860

Criminal Code

Bill S-205. Report stage	25860
Motion No. 1 negated	25862
Ms. Dancho	25862
Motion for concurrence	25862
Motion agreed to	25863
Third reading	25863
Motion agreed to	25864
(Bill read the third time and passed)	25864

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Carr	25865
----------------	-------

Finance

Mr. Morantz	25865
Motion for concurrence	25865
Ms. Saks	25866
Mr. Ste-Marie	25867
Mr. Johns	25867
Mr. Albas	25867
Mr. Lamoureux	25869
Mr. Ste-Marie	25869
Mr. Davies	25869
Mr. Lamoureux	25869
Mr. Caputo	25872
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	25872
Mr. Johns	25872
Mr. Oliphant	25873
Mr. Ste-Marie	25873
Mr. Ste-Marie	25873
Mr. Carr	25876

Mr. Gourde	25876
Mr. Johns	25876
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	25877
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	25877
Mr. Davies	25877

Mr. Lamoureux	25882
Mrs. Gray	25883
Mr. Johns	25884
Ms. Chabot	25886

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Old Age Security Act

Bill C-319. Report stage	25879
Ms. Larouche	25879
Motion for concurrence	25879
(Motion agreed to)	25879
Third reading	25879
Mr. Lamoureux	25881
Mr. Gourde	25881
Mr. Johns	25882

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Finance

Mr. Lake	25887
Mrs. Brière	25887

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Vuong	25888
Mr. Chiang	25889

Health

Mr. Johns	25889
Mrs. Brière	25890

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>