



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 391
Tuesday, December 17, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 17, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

• (1005)
[English]

PRIVILEGE

ACCESS TO PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on December 6 by the member for Thornhill concerning access to the parliamentary precinct.

In her intervention, the member alleged that a protest in the lobby of the Confederation Building on the morning of Tuesday, December 3 impeded her ability to access her parliamentary office and, more broadly, obstructed parliamentary business. She stated that, in some other instances, meetings had to be cancelled. Citing procedural authorities, previous rulings and committee reports on past incidents regarding access to the precinct, the member noted that such matters typically constitute *prima facie* breaches of privilege.

The member further argued that media reports on December 5 suggested that the members for Edmonton Strathcona, Hamilton Centre and Winnipeg Centre joined the protesters in the lobby of the building and were thereby complicit in preventing other members from accessing their offices. She suggested that this was an intentional obstruction of Parliament and could constitute contempt.

[Translation]

Other members intervened to provide their accounts of what transpired that morning, including the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster, who stated that her safety and her staff's safety were jeopardized.

For their part, the members for Edmonton Strathcona, Hamilton Centre and Winnipeg Centre disputed the claims that they were involved in the organization of the protest. The member for New Westminster—Burnaby further noted that the question of privilege was raised several days after the events took place and therefore not at the earliest opportunity.

The Chair must first clearly state that the safety and security of members, staff and other visitors is always taken very seriously. Nobody should feel unsafe anywhere within the parliamentary precinct.

[English]

Upon hearing the concerns raised by the member for Thornhill, I immediately inquired with the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Parliamentary Protective Service, known as PPS, to ascertain the circumstances of the protest. Their account of events shows that, throughout the protest, the safety of individuals, including members, and the security of the precinct was never compromised. Furthermore, the appropriate level of resources, which were nonetheless significant, was deployed and the situation was resolved in a timely and peaceful manner.

In her submission, the member for Thornhill noted that media reports in the days following the incident led her to raise her question of privilege when she did, as they demonstrated an organized attempt to obstruct the business of Parliament. However, the Chair's view is that any obstruction to members, their staff and guests would have been apparent in the moment, regardless of what media reports would subsequently reveal. As a result, in raising her question on December 6, when the incident occurred on the morning of December 3, the Chair is not satisfied that the member raised the matter at the earliest opportunity. Nevertheless, the Chair still wishes to address this question of privilege by assessing the merits of the matter.

[Translation]

In the case before us, the Chair is being asked to determine if the events of December 3 impeded members in the discharge of their parliamentary duties. As stated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 108:

Over the years, Members have regularly brought to the attention of the House instances which they believed were attempts to obstruct, impede, interfere, intimidate or molest them, their staff or individuals who had some business with them or the House.

It further states on the same page:

Speakers have consistently upheld the right of the House to the services of its Members free from intimidation, obstruction and interference.

[English]

The incident was disruptive and stressful. It was indeed regrettable, for instance, that one member's guest cancelled his visit because of security concerns. It is nonetheless important to the Chair to reassure members that PPS followed the necessary protocols for addressing these types of situations. The PPS officers prioritize safety for all while allowing members to enter the building.

Routine Proceedings

During the protest in the main entrance and lobby of the Confederation Building, members, staff and business visitors were redirected to enter the building through an alternate entrance while PPS officers dealt with the protest inside the building. Where warranted, PPS officers escorted members and their visitors to a secondary and secure door into the building.

[Translation]

In her submission, the member for Thornhill referred to previous cases where members were impeded in some way. Several examples involved a variety of events, such as protests or police security cordons that resulted in delays for members trying to access the precinct or the Chamber. The Chair would like to point out that breaches of privilege generally involved members being impeded in their access to a proceeding of the House or its committees. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states at page 109:

In order to find a prima facie breach of privilege, the Speaker must be satisfied that there is evidence to support the Member's claim that he or she has been impeded in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions and that the matter is directly related to a proceeding of Parliament.

In a ruling on a similar matter involving a sit-in in a minister's office, coincidentally also in the Confederation Building, Speaker Milliken stated on March 25, 2011, at page 9246 of the Debates:

...in this particular case...there is little evidence to suggest that the staff of the minister were obstructed in the fulfillment of their duties.... In view of the very high threshold required in adjudicating such situations, in this circumstance the Chair cannot find that a prima facie question of privilege has arisen in this matter.

• (1010)

[English]

In the current case, while it was indeed disruptive, the Chair cannot conclude that members were prevented from discharging their parliamentary duties as concerns parliamentary proceedings. Accordingly, based on this high threshold, the Chair does not find the matter constitutes a prima facie question of privilege.

The Chair also wishes to address the allegations that members were involved in or assisted in organizing the protest. All three members named, while expressing sympathy for the cause of the protesters, categorically denied being involved in organizing the protest, stating that their interactions with the demonstrators were brief and unplanned. As is the custom of this place, the Chair takes members at their word.

That said, I would encourage all members to think twice before doing anything that could be construed as supporting a demonstration inside one of our parliamentary office buildings. While the grounds outside are open to the public and may be used for protests within certain guidelines, the buildings themselves are not public spaces and therefore, for obvious reasons, should not be used for this purpose. It is a very basic matter of security. While some members may be sympathetic to a cause and feel that a protest poses no risk to them, they should recognize that their colleagues may not feel the same way, and if the shoe were on the other foot with another cause in the future, their reaction might be very different.

I thank all members for their attention.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made Monday, June 10, it is my duty to table, in both official languages, a letter I have received from the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel regarding the production of documents from the government, Sustainable Development Technology Canada and the Auditor General of Canada.

* * *

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CANADA

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table, in both official languages, "Public Accounts of Canada 2024". I can confirm that the Auditor General has provided once again an unqualified audit opinion on the Government of Canada's financial statements. I have multiple binders here that will evidence the foregoing.

* * *

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 8(2) of the Auditor General Act, a report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons entitled "Commentary on the 2023-2024 Financial Audits".

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(g), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

* * *

2023-24 DEPARTMENTAL RESULTS REPORT

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, on behalf of 87 departments and agencies, the "2023-24 Departmental Results Report".

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and in accordance with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled "General Security of Information Agreement between Canada and Ukraine", done at Brussels on December 3, 2024.

• (1015)
[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 11 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

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.

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

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1055)

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

(Division No. 926)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Badawey	Baker
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blois
Boissonnault	Bradford
Brière	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gerretsen	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio

Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McLeod
Mendicino
Miller
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Wilkinson
Zahid

Routine Proceedings

LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
Mendès
Miao
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Sarai
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Yip
Zuberi— 144

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Dalton
Dance	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Green
Hallan	Hoback

Routine Proceedings

Hughes	Idlout
Jeneroux	Jivani
Johns	Julian
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	MacGregor
Maguire	Majumdar
Masse	Mathysen
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McLean	McPherson
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Sauvé	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seebach	Shields
Shiple	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Van Popta	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zarrillo
Zimmer— 167	

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (1100)

CANADA FRESH WATER DAY ACT

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce An Act to establish Canada Fresh Water Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to introduce a bill entitled an act to establish Canada fresh water day.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House proceed to first reading of Senate public bills.

The Deputy 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.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I request a recorded division, please, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1140)

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

(Division No. 927)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Ali	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Bragdon
Brassard	Brière
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carr	Carrie
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Chambers	Champagne
Champoux	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Cooper
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Damoff
Dance	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	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 (Provence)	Fast
Ferreri	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Gallant
Garon	Gaudreau
Généreux	Genius
Gerretsen	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Gray
Guilbeault	Hajdu

Routine Proceedings

Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hutchings
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khanna
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Majumdar
Martel
Masse
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean
McPherson
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morantz
Morrison
Motz
Muys
Nater
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Petipas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Romanado
Rota
Sahota
Saks
Sauvé
Scarpaleggia
Schiefke
Seeback
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Sousa
Ste-Marie
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl

Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hussen
Ien
Jivani
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod
Melillo
Mendicino
Michaud
Moore
Morrice
Morrisey
Murray
Naqvi
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Patzer
Pauzé
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Rogers
Rood
Ruff
Sajjan
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Seheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Small
Soroka
Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
St-Onge
Stubbs

Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Thompson
Tolmie
Trudel
Valdez
van Koevorden
Vandal
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zimmer

Tassi
Thériault
Thomas
Tochor
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zuberi— 296

NAYS

Members

Angus
Bachrach
Boulerice
Collins (Victoria)
Garrison
Hughes
Johns
Mathysen
Zarrillo— 17

Ashton
Blaney
Cannings
Desjarlais
Green
Idlout
MacGregor
Singh

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I move that the second report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, presented on Thursday, October 27, 2022, be concurred in.

I will be splitting my time with the member for Bay of Quinte.

This report, from October 2022, is on the softwood lumber dispute. Two years later, absolutely nothing has been accomplished by the incompetent Liberal government, which is now mired in even deeper chaos after the events of yesterday. Therefore, its chance of being resolved any time soon is a distant memory.

In fact, last night, the people of B.C. had an opportunity to pass judgment on the corrupt, incompetent Liberal government and its handling of the softwood lumber file. Tamara Jansen won Cloverdale—Langley City by a whopping 50%. She did not have 50% of the vote; she won by 50%.

● (1145)

The Deputy Speaker: I have a point of order.

The hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek.

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, I know I am new here and you do not always get my title quickly, but I want to suggest that we are here to talk about a very important thing, which is a concurrence motion on international trade. If you are trying to keep people on the point, I would suggest that the comments have already made by my hon. colleague, and we should move on to international trade.

The Deputy Speaker: I will remind everyone to stick to relevance, but the hon. member was 40 seconds into his speech.

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why Liberals do not want to talk about the absolute thrashing they took in British Columbia, where softwood lumber is the big issue that the committee reported. The people of British Columbia have delivered their judgment on the corrupt, woke, incompetent Prime Minister with a resounding victory in Cloverdale—Langley City by Tamara Jansen by 50% of the vote. The NDP was reduced to 12% with their—

The Deputy Speaker: I have another point of order from the member for Humber River—Black Creek.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Mr. Speaker, we are here to discuss international trade. I recognize the importance of different things that went on yesterday, but if we are going to have a fruitful debate, I would ask that we focus on the issue at hand. I know my vice-chair and the other members are anxious to add their comments.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I drew a straight line from the substance of the debate, which dealt with international trade, and the election results. I am quite interested to hear more about the connection between international trade and the election results last night.

The Deputy Speaker: As members know, we give a lot of latitude on what we can bring forward. We know we have specific amounts of time, and I will ask the hon. member to get to the point at hand.

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, of course, the NDP, for their continued cowardly support of the woke Prime Minister, got 12% of the vote. The costly coalition is delivering devastating electoral results for the government.

With that, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to international trade, technically, no government in the history of Canada has signed off on more trade agreements than the current government. That speaks volumes about the degree to which the government understands and appreciates that Canada is a trading nation and that part of being a trading nation is supporting Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it.

I am a bit surprised that, in the most recent vote on a trade agreement with Ukraine, the Conservatives voted against a Canada-Ukraine trade agreement; this includes the member who just spoke. I suspect I am going to get more time as we go on this morning, and I look forward to telling the Conservatives why they are an absolute and total failure when it comes to the trade file over the last year.

Can the member explain why he voted against the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, it is simple. They tried to put a carbon tax in a trade agreement for the first time ever. It was desperate and pathetic; we voted against a bad trade agreement. To get back to the point at hand, on softwood lumber, nine billion dollars' worth of duties have now been collected by the United States and tens of thousands of workers are out of work. Moreover, the person who chairs the Canada cabinet committee for Canada-United States relations just resigned, saying that the government is engaging in election gimmicks.

At a time when we are facing 25% tariffs from the incoming president of the United States and a nine-year dispute on softwood lumber going nowhere, their incompetence is unrivalled in terms of this file. The only question I really have is this: Why is the NDP still supporting the terrible government, especially after getting crushed in B.C. with 12% in this by-election?

• (1150)

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to speak to the international trade motion, but after listening carefully to my Conservative colleague's speech, I will ask him a question about the Cloverdale—Langley City byelection instead. The Conservative candidate who was elected is a former member of this Parliament known for her highly controversial opinions. For one thing, she is pro-life.

I would like to know what my Conservative colleague thinks about her arrival in caucus. Will it strengthen that particular position within his party?

[English]

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what controversial views he is talking about. What I do know is this: She got 66% of the vote, crushing the Liberals by 50%. Every member in the Liberal caucus now knows their seat is in danger. They have lost elections in Toronto and Montreal, and they have now been destroyed in British Columbia. The other thing that is concerning for the NDP is that it got 12% in British Columbia. The chickens are coming home to roost for an NDP leader who pathetically and continuously supports the corrupt, woke Liberal government. They are getting served what they deserve in British Columbia, and they will when there is a carbon tax election as well.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the reason Conservatives could not even muster a full speech on international trade is that their record has been so lamentable. We look at the CBSA cuts they put into place during the corrupt Harper regime, actually eliminating almost 1,200 frontline positions. This has led, of course, to the kinds of problems we are seeing now at the border. They voted against the Ukraine trade deal as well.

When the Conservatives were in place under Harper, the Harper regime had a terrible record of selling out this country. This is why the Conservatives presented a concurrence motion and then could not even muster a 10-minute speech to actually talk about international trade. It is because their record has been so poor.

I would like to come back to my colleague and simply ask him this: Why did they kill 1,200 positions in CBSA, leading to the crisis we see today?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad the NDP member brought up selling out. What we are seeing in this country right now is the NDP leader selling out Canadians for his pension. The NDP is getting its just desserts on that. With 12%, they almost did not get their rebate in the by-election that just happened in British Columbia. The NDP leader is continually bowing down to the Liberal Prime Minister, repeatedly propping him up in the face of all his corruption and everything he has done to destroy this country. Every once in a while, NDP members puff up and say they are against this or against that. However, when push comes to shove, they sell out every single time to prop up the corrupt, incompetent, out-of-control, radical Liberal government. He should be ashamed of himself.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Adam Smith is the father of modern economics, and he understood a timeless truth: Trade is wealth. When we talk about trade and trading nations, we can say that trading nations do best when they sell the things they produce the best and trade for the rest.

Canada is a trading nation, or it should be. We sit, as Canadians, with the most natural resources per capita of all nations on the planet. Canadians should be rich from that. We are third among countries with the most oil in the world and sixth in terms of natural gas. We have all the things the world needs for batteries and critical minerals. We are number one with potash. We have some of the best mines but, right now, Canadians are broke because the trade deals that the government has put together have been terrible for workers, for paycheques and for Canadians.

We now face a bigger problem with the Americans. Americans smell weakness in the Prime Minister and the government. After nine years of fleecing the government, we have a GDP per capita in Canada that is \$32,000 less per worker, per Canadian, than our American counterparts have. We have seen half a trillion dollars of investment go south. We have lost 90,000 softwood lumber jobs as we have been mired in bad trade deals.

When we have a weak Prime Minister and a weak government, it means that we need a strong opposition to formulate a trade partnership with our trade committee. That way, we can study the upcoming CUSMA trade deal to make sure that we are tackling the weakness of the Prime Minister versus the strong president-elect coming into the U.S. We can then ensure that we have strength from the Parliament, because we certainly do not have it from the government.

We are asking for this trade committee to reconvene so that we can bring forth many witnesses to study the effects that a Donald Trump government would have on Canada, Canadians and workers.

I am going to read an amendment to our motion today.

I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following: "the second report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, presented on Thursday, October 27, 2022, be not now concurred in but that it be recommended to the Committee for further consideration, including in relation to the protection of Canadian jobs, especially unionized jobs, in the electric

Routine Proceedings

vehicle, softwood lumber and other sectors, given the announced policy of the incoming United States administration of President-elect Donald Trump to impose 25 percent tariffs on all Canadian exports to the United States, provided that, for the purposes of this study:

(a) the holders of the following offices recognized in law, howsoever styled, shall each be ordered to appear, individually, as witnesses, for at least two hours each, at the prescribed dates and times, for which the Committee shall be instructed to meet at those times:

(i) the Minister of Labour on Monday, January 6, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(ii) the Minister of Industry on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(iii) the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(iv) the Minister for International Trade on Wednesday, January 8, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(v) the Director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service on Wednesday, January 8, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(vi) the Minister of Foreign Affairs on Thursday, January 9, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(vii) the President of the Canada Border Services Agency on Thursday, January 9, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(viii) the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on Monday, January 13, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(ix) the Ambassador of Canada to the United States of America on Monday, January 13, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(x) the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness on Tuesday, January 14, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(xi) the National Security and Intelligence Advisor to the Prime Minister on Tuesday, January 14, 2025, at 2 p.m.,

(xii) the Minister of Finance on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 11 a.m.,

(xiii) the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 2 p.m., and

(xiv) the Prime Minister on Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 11 a.m.;

(b) the Committee shall hold such other additional meetings, as may be necessary, during the weeks of January 6 and 13, 2025, to hear from stakeholders, experts, union leaders, premiers or other representatives of provincial and territorial governments, and other witnesses who are proposed by the members of the Committee; and

(c) if a new or increased tariff is imposed by the United States government during the week of January 20, 2025, (i) the Committee shall meet within 24 hours of any such announcement, and (ii) the Committee may order the re-attendance of any minister named in paragraph (a), as the Committee sees fit.

● (1155)

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. deputy House leader.

● (1200)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, much has been said this morning about the election in Cloverdale—Langley City yesterday, especially by the member for Dufferin—Caledon. I would like to remind Canadians exactly who the Conservatives ran in the election and who won last night. This individual was a member of Parliament before. Once, on a Friday morning, while I was sitting in this chair in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic, the individual said the following during a debate on conversion therapy, quoting Matthew:

Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like white-washed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of the bones of the dead and everything unclean.

Routine Proceedings

That is how she referred to our LGBT community. Yes, congratulations to my Conservative colleagues. They have elected somebody for their party who is true to form of what they represent.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Mr. Speaker, if I got thrashed like the Liberals did last night, I would be willing to turn the page and talk about something else too. Let us talk about trade for a minute.

Our Canadian dollar just dipped below 70¢ this morning for the first time. For Canadians who are already facing the highest grocery bills they have ever had after nine years of the Liberal government, that means grocery bills are going up again. A single mother in Kingston has to go to the grocery store to try to buy milk, food and bread for her children and, by the way, is getting no tax back during a so-called GST holiday this season. They now have to face higher grocery bills at the grocery store. Shame on the government. Shame on the member for thrashing another member of Parliament. He should look at himself.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the whole, I find the amendment interesting. I am always in favour of more accountability in Parliament. Obviously, that has a lot to do with the work done in committee.

I would like to mention something that we experienced at the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs. There was a situation similar to the one today. A Conservative motion called on the Minister of Official Languages to appear before the committee. This created a lot of controversy because the minister resigned in the meantime. The Liberals fought to ensure that the new Minister of Official Languages would be the one to appear, not the member for Edmonton Centre. They had to come back to the House to drag this out, and I have a feeling we are going to go through that again today.

Before moving his motion to call forward the Prime Minister, has my Conservative colleague considered the fact that he may no longer be Prime Minister when he is invited?

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Williams: Mr. Speaker, we can only dream.

Canadians are unanimous in agreeing that the Prime Minister needs to resign and that we need a new government. However, we are faced with the reality that the Prime Minister is not going anywhere, buoyed up by the New Democrats, who seem to think all is well.

One of the biggest issues we have coming up is our trading agreements, particularly with the Americans. When we look at precedents for the House of Commons in any capacity, it is on our trading relationship with the Americans. It is so bad that the premiers are stepping up. Our Prime Minister is so weak that it is the premiers who are standing up for Canada right now. The Premier of Quebec stood up and said he will make sure he puts resources into the border because the President-elect is threatening tariffs if we do not take care of our border.

We should want to take care of our borders, not just for that relationship, but because Canadians should want to see a secure border.

Let us make sure we stand up behind those premiers, stand up where this Prime Minister is not and stand up for Canada.

● (1205)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the official opposition is supposed to be a government that is prepared to put in place policies, and tragically, the Conservatives have been absolutely lamentable when it comes to border security. They are the ones that devastated our CBSA staff, with 1,200 officers eliminated under the Harper regime.

Tragically, the Liberals have not restored all those positions, only some of them, and that is the crux of the problem. Conservative inaction and Conservative cuts have made our border less secure. Will any single Conservative stand up and apologize for what they did in devastating border security?

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, if anyone needs to apologize, it is the NDP for asking the Conservatives, who nine years ago made changes when there was not a problem with the border. They had nine years to fix it and now are complaining about the border not being fixed.

We are going to put the resources into the border. We are going to stop the problems that are occurring at the border. We are going to make sure the fentanyl traffickers the NDP-Liberal government allowed are put behind bars. We are going to take care of the border because the government will not.

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 to talk about a very important issue. I have been advocating for Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it in a very big way, virtually since 2016, when we came into government and presented our first budget. I do not say that lightly. A big part of the whole trade file is to start off by saying that Canada is a trading nation. We depend on exports and world trade more than virtually any other country, and it has really helped elevate Canada to the nation it is today. We have incredible workforces in a multitude of industries, which we are supporting through commodities, products and services throughout the world. I have always been a strong advocate for the importance of international trade, which is so important to all of us.

Routine Proceedings

I find it interesting that the Conservative Party wanted to talk about trade today, when we contrast the Conservative Party, especially over the last couple of years, and the policy positions it has taken, to what we have done as a government. In the form of a question, I made it known to the Conservatives that I would like to expand upon some of the things we have witnessed over the last nine years. For example, people should be aware that no other government in the history of Canada has signed off on as many trade agreements with other countries as this government has, which has had a profound, positive impact for all Canadians in all regions because it creates jobs and opportunities in real and tangible ways. It also invites others to look at Canada as a place to invest.

Back in 2023, Canada was number one in the G7, on a per capita basis, for foreign investment coming into a country; worldwide, on the same metric, Canada was number three. When we get private sectors, non-profits and other levels of governments, a whole combination of things around the world, looking at Canada and saying they want to invest in Canada, a number of factors are at play. One is that, as a government, over the last nine years, we have been so successful in negotiating and getting signed trade agreements, and that has had a very positive impact in all communities in Canada.

When we hear about the U.S.A. and the tariffs proposed by President-elect Trump, it gives us a bit of a flashback to Trump's first administration, when then President Trump took a very hard line and the Conservatives virtually buckled almost instantly. They were critical of the government, saying things like, "Do what is necessary. Capitulate and get an agreement signed." It was not that long ago that President Trump, for the first time, challenged Canada and our trade policies. We did not listen to the Conservatives; instead, we put Canadians first and foremost and we continued with the negotiations.

● (1210)

One of the things that I have said in the past and that I continue to believe today, which was reinforced during a recent trade mission that I personally attended, is that Canada, as a nation, has the best trade negotiators in the world. They are second to no others, and there is real, tangible experience within that collective group.

As a government, we have made it very clear that we are going to put the interests of Canadians and workers first whenever it comes to trade negotiations, which is unlike the Conservative Party, and unlike the leader of the Conservative Party, who made the decision back then to capitulate.

One of the differences between the leader of the Conservative Party and the government is how they deal with trade. The leader of the Conservative Party goes around promoting, in every forum he virtually goes to, that Canada is broken. He plays into a lot of the issues the president-elect brings up, such as the issue of border controls. There is so much hypocrisy in the misinformation being provided by the leader of the Conservative Party.

We talk about trade between Canada and the United States, and the leader of the Conservative Party goes around saying things like we cannot do anything with our borders and that our border system is broken. Number one, that is not true. It is just not true. Number two, one would think he was negotiating on behalf of Donald Trump and the United States. Shame on him for that sort of atti-

tude. If members want a third thing, when he was in government, when he sat around the cabinet table, his decision back then was to cut services to the border controls, whether it was sniffer dogs or just the overall number of border officers. He made significant cuts. There were well over a thousand jobs cut from border controls. Members can imagine that.

We now have a leader of the Conservative Party, a mouthpiece on negotiations for Donald Trump, going around saying that there are no border controls and that things are broken in Canada, yet he is the one, when he sat around a cabinet table, who made serious cuts that caused a great deal of damage. We, as government, restored those cuts, and we did not capitulate, like the Conservatives advocated for us to do on the first round of Donald Trump. Those are the facts.

Then we have the leader of the Conservative Party, on the slogan tours he takes across the country, trying to give the false impression that Canada is broken.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it is shameful.

As the Government of Canada, we should be taking a team Canada approach. There are some things that are more important to Canadians, such as our lifestyle and the need to be in sync when it comes to negotiating with the United States on the trade file. As opposed to being an ally to President-elect Trump, the leader of the Conservative Party should be looking at being an ally with Canadians in dealing with the need to have a negotiated agreement with the United States that is fair and good for Canadians and that puts Canadians first.

The leader of the Conservative Party has not demonstrated that in real terms. He might have fancy slogans, and he might be able to pump them out like there is no tomorrow, but when it comes to serving Canadians in a real and challenging way, I would suggest that the leader of the Conservative Party is found wanting. That is the reality of it. Trade is so important because it means jobs and opportunities, whether that is in the service industry, the constructing of widgets or food security.

● (1215)

I had the opportunity earlier this month to be part of a trade mission to the Philippines. It was a wonderful opportunity, and I was grateful to have been with the Minister of International Trade, who did an outstanding job. Through diplomacy, we were able to bring in what is, arguably, according to President Marcos, one of the largest trade missions that he has seen in many years in the Philippines. What happened—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, this is an important debate on international trade, but Conservatives are not showing up, even though they provoked this, so I call quorum.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the member that he can call quorum, but he should not be saying who is or is not in the chamber.

We do not have quorum at this time, so the bells will ring.

And the bells having rung:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We now have quorum.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader can resume his speech.

• (1220)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I know the Conservatives do not necessarily want to hear what I have to say because of their abysmal performance on Ukraine and other trade agreements, but maybe that is a good place to pick up after I finish commenting.

Because of the interruption, let me start again in regard to what I thought was a very important initiative for me. I have been encouraging and advocating for better trade relations between Canada and the Philippines for many years. That is the reason I was so pleased to be a part of a trade mission to the Philippines, where the Minister of International Trade was an absolutely wonderful host to such a degree that even President Marcos commented on the size of the trade mission because it is the largest that he had seen in many years.

We had 800 participants, hundreds from Canada and hundreds from the Philippines. It was businesses and others coming together in what I have described is almost like speed dating between businesses as they were making connections, all for one purpose, which was to increase the opportunities of both nations to expand upon trade, and there are a couple of things that I would really want to highlight.

Through the trade mission, and because of its success, the minister and the government ultimately announced that we are now entering into exploratory discussions for a trade agreement between Canada and the Philippines. That is good news, both for Canada and the Philippines. There are so many opportunities that are there. Earlier this year, back in February, I was in the Philippines with the Minister of Agriculture, and we actually opened up an agri-trade office to recognize how Canada could play a strong role in the Philippines through its Manila office, and that office dealt with 30-plus Asia-Pacific countries, all based on agricultural types of trade opportunities.

There is no doubt that the relationship between Canada and Philippines continues to grow and has never been better than what we have today with the government, and we are going to continue to push. I understand that those exploratory discussions could begin as early as this January. I can assure the House that I will continue to push and advocate for that trade agreement, much like I advocated for the the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement.

Let us have a flashback to the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement. I recall the heated discussions that were taking place on the floor of

the House of Commons when we had the president of Ukraine, at a time of war, come to Canada to sign a trade agreement with Canada. It showed us the sense of urgency and why it is Ukraine wanted to be able to have this agreement signed off. It was such an important thing, and at the end of the day, when I stop to think about it, every member of the House, except for the Conservatives, actually voted in favour of it.

I think the community outside of the Ottawa bubble was shocked to see the very first trade agreement that the Conservatives ever voted against was the actual Canada-Ukraine trade agreement update. It was incredible to see Conservative after Conservative stand in his or her place to say no to Ukraine, while at the same time we saw members of the NDP, the Green party, the Bloc and, of course, Liberals, recognize the value of having that trade agreement with Ukraine. I cannot believe that the Conservatives voted against it.

Why is trade important? Let me give a tangible example. One of the industries that I often talk about is Manitoba's pork industry. It is such a wonderful industry. It has created literally thousands of jobs in the province of Manitoba. It has focused a great deal of concentration in the city of Winnipeg, with thousands of jobs, including in Brandon and Neepawa, and that is not to mention many rural communities, where we see the hogs.

• (1225)

I can tell members that the pork industry wants to see trade expand very much. It is an exporting industry in Manitoba. There are many concerns in regards to it, but the bottom line is that securing markets is absolutely critical to the pork industry. I will always stand up to defend and advocate for this.

All one needs to do is take a look at the industry. I think that eight million hogs or pigs will be born in Manitoba. We have a population of just under 1.4 million people, yet we have eight million pigs. Members, I am sure, can do the math and figure out that pork is being exported. Companies like HyLife have created hundreds of jobs in the community of Neepawa and are very much dependent on exports. When we had the trade mission in the Philippines, there were representatives from HyLife and Maple Leaf. Maple Leaf has a beautiful plant in Brandon, with well over 1,000 jobs there. Maple Leaf has a beautiful plant in Winnipeg with well over 1,000 jobs there. These are direct jobs, but there are also indirect jobs. These are all very important jobs.

Take a look at Winnipeg. We can talk about the New Flyer industry, the world-class buses with export markets to the United States and distribution throughout Canada. We produce some of the best, if not the best, public transportation on buses. We see that. On the streets of Ottawa we can see the New Flyer industry. That industry is dependent. It needs and wants to see these types of trade agreements because they make a difference.

What I would suggest to members is that with a Liberal administration, they do not have to worry about a government that will capitulate like the leader of the Conservative Party or the Conservative Party in general would do when it comes to negotiations with the United States, Europe or any other part of the world. We understand the true value of trade. We will continue to fight for that because that means jobs. That means a stronger, healthier middle class. That is something we want to see. We will continue, no matter how the Conservatives want to change the focus. That will be our focus: Canadians first in a very real and tangible way. We can see the tangible results of the types of things that we have done as government, especially, on the trade file.

Hopefully, I will get some more time later to talk on it. Having said that, I do have a subamendment. I move, seconded by the member from Waterloo:

That the amendment be amended by replacing the words “24 hours” with the words “48 hours”.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The subamendment is in order.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Kelowna—Lake Country.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the intervention from the Liberal member, he talked about trade and he talked a lot about jobs. I wanted to ask him specifically about all of the forestry workers who have lost jobs in Canada, especially in British Columbia, where I am from. The government failed to negotiate a softwood lumber agreement as part of CUSMA. It also failed to negotiate a separate softwood lumber agreement over the last nine years of the government under three U.S. administrations.

I would like to ask the member why the government does not consider a softwood lumber agreement important with the United States, especially considering the thousands of jobs that have been lost in Canada.

• (1230)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the leader of the Conservative Party sat around a cabinet table with Stephen Harper when he capitulated. He suggested we do the same on the trade agreement with the United States in regard to the whole softwood industry. As a result of his capitulation back then, we literally lost a significant portion of a potential industry that could have grown. The Conservatives like to say they got a deal. Anyone can score a deal. What is at stake is getting a deal that is in the best interest of Canadians that will create the maximum number of opportunities for Canadians.

What we have learned through time and experience is that the Conservatives are eager to capitulate when negotiations get tough. Let us contrast that to us. We will continue to advocate as we have. As I indicated, no other government in the history of Canada has signed off on more trade agreements than this government has.

[Translation]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened to the speech by my Liberal colleague, the parliamentary secretary to the govern-

Routine Proceedings

ment House leader and I was a bit shocked. In listening to him talk about virtually everything and nothing, I really got the impression that he is living in a parallel universe. Between the chaotic circus we saw yesterday in Parliament and the calls for the Prime Minister's resignation by nearly every party leader across the way, I get the impression that this government has lost all credibility. The parliamentary secretary was speaking about all sorts of other things.

This is the eve of the Christmas holidays. Does the parliamentary secretary not think that his leader and his government might actually need a permanent vacation? What credibility do the Liberals have left? What are they going to tell their constituents when they see them during the holiday season?

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, members opposite will excuse me for not necessarily wanting to focus on what the desires of the opposition members might be, but rather wanting to focus my attention on what Canadians want to see. I can tell members opposite that what Canadians want to see is a government that continues to move forward on a number of different issues.

I am surprised the member did not ask about supply management. I always thought that the Bloc would want to highlight that issue. Given that the member did not highlight that, allow me to highlight it. When it comes to the issue of supply management, it has been Liberals who have brought forward and introduced supply management here in Canada, and it is going to be a Liberal government that continues to protect supply management. When we talk about negotiations with Trump, let us not kid ourselves: The Conservatives under the current Conservative leader would throw supply management out the door. Canadians need to be concerned. If we want to protect issues like supply management when it comes to trade agreements, we have to be very careful to ensure that the Conservatives never have the opportunity to deal that away, because it is such an important issue.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not ask my colleague to consider some of the comments that have been made today by members of the Conservative Party, congratulating the newly elected, soon-to-be MP for Cloverdale—Langley City. We know that this newly elected member is another blatantly homophobic member of Parliament soon to be here among us. I am curious to know how much money has been spent through fundraising, on misinformation that was put into this campaign to make sure that we have another far-right, homophobic Conservative in this House.

We know that when Harper was in his position, there were so many positions lost. There were 1,100 to 1,200 positions lost from CBSA frontline officers. We lost 100,000 jobs in mills across Canada. Why did the Liberals not put us in a better position today so that when Trump comes in, we are not in the same position?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on the member's first comment about the by-election yesterday. It is a reflection on the leadership of the Conservative Party because the Conservatives would be aware of the personality, which they feel very comfortable with.

The member for Cloverdale—Langley City has said this inside the chamber:

Routine Proceedings

Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of the bones of the dead and everything unclean.

The member is referring to the LGB community, and I think—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1235)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. Conservatives are heckling that the quote was a reference to Liberals, and now they are laughing, when that is what their brand new colleague said in this House about three years ago.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but that is a point of debate and not a point of order.

I do want to remind members to please listen to the questions and the answers without disruption. Everybody deserves that respect here in the House. Everybody knows the rules.

I will ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to wrap it up so that we can go to a different question.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member for Kingston and the Islands and others now have raised the issue with the Conservative Party. Hopefully, during question period or during one of the questions the Conservatives ask, they can actually say that they still stand by statements of this nature, or say something to at least try to give some sort of clarity in terms of what the Conservative Party really believes about its candidate.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was listening intently to the member's speech and his comments. It is interesting that we are having a debate on international trade today. I really appreciated his comments on supply management because Canadians should be aware that the Conservative Party's position is not one of supporting supply management in Canada.

When we renegotiated the NAFTA, which is known as CUSMA, we had a team Canada approach. All political parties, all Canadians, coast to coast to coast, were there together. What we saw under Ukraine when we were fighting for international law was that all members of Parliament, Canadians, were together, but the Conservatives changed their ways and they chose Russia and Putin over Ukraine.

Similarly, when we saw a Canadian killed on Canadian soil and there was intelligence that it was by a foreign entity, the first day everyone stood together, but the next day, the leader of the Conservative Party was calling out Canada rather than calling out India. What I find is interesting is right now we know we might be up for another battle with our cousins to the south.

What kind of confidence should Canadians have in the Conservative Party? Do they pick Canadians first or do they pick Conservatives first?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I really do believe that the more Canadians get to know the degree to which the leader of the Conservative Party is in fact to the far right, they will get a better appreciation as to why Conservatives should not form government. We are talking about trade today. On the issue of trade, let there be no doubt that the Conservative Party of Canada's commitment to supply management is weak at best.

When we hear the leader of the Conservative Party's willingness to capitulate, I would not be surprised at all if we lost supply management if there were ever to be a Conservative government going up against discussions on trade with the United States. I genuinely believe that would be at risk. Individuals get quality products, all sorts of benefits under supply management. We need to be aware of the consequences of voting for a far-right Conservative.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Madam Speaker, when we look at what has happened in the last nine years with the relationship with the Americans, the failed trade deal and the weak Prime Minister we have, Canada has gone from being the number one trading party of the Americans to now the third. Mexico is number one.

Let us look at some of the reasons. They include taxes and regulations. Canada has increased the carbon tax over five times; it is going to increase the carbon tax again by 19% on April 1. The Americans do not have a carbon tax. If we look at regulations, we have capital gains increases, taxes in Canada that are almost double the Americans. In Texas, there are no federal taxes. The state tax is only 25%. We have taxes, regulations and now loss of wealth. The member mentioned Manitoba is really important to him. It has 10% of its economy linked to U.S. trade. If there is a 25% tariff, that is going to hurt the economy.

Is the member prepared to lose 10% of the economy in Manitoba?

● (1240)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the short answer is no, I do not want to lose that. This is the reason why Canadians need to be aware that the Conservative Party of Canada, in particular this leader of the Conservative Party, will capitulate. He will sell out Canada in order to get any form of an agreement with Donald Trump. This is the reality of it. I believe the more Canadians become acquainted with the leader of the Conservative Party, the more they will adopt the conclusion I have come to, which is that the Conservative Party is the greatest threat to trade here in Canada in protecting certain industries, including supply management.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very honoured to rise today in the parliament of America's 51st state, albeit in the absence of its governor.

All kidding aside, I think we are dealing here with a very important, troubling situation. Let us be clear: We must not bury our heads in the sand, but neither should we engage in fearmongering. We are still talking about the threat of tariffs, but our discussions centre around issues that are still hypothetical. Very hypothetical, in fact. The basis for all this is a message posted on Truth Social, but one must read it to the end. People saw it as an announcement that these tariffs would be imposed on January 20, when Mr. Trump assumes the U.S. presidency, but the message goes on to say that tariffs will be imposed unless profound changes are made at the Mexican and Canadian borders.

I think we must also consider Mr. Trump's history, especially in the business world, and the vision he has always had, both as a candidate and as President during his first administration. Although it is safe to say that Mr. Trump has changed the face of politics and has in some way innovated it, his vision of international relations remains a traditional one. It is a 1990s vision of a purportedly happy "pre-globalization" era. People began to think there would be a new world order, international citizenship, global rules that would bring an end to all rivalries and to national interests, even to nations themselves. That certainly is no longer the case. Mr. Trump has always had a far more traditional, confrontational vision, one that sees negotiations between sovereign states as being based on their relationships and balance of power.

Although this announcement is not really an announcement, it can be viewed as concerning. It is fair to assume that the incoming U.S. administration and the President-elect are flexing their muscles and planning to negotiate to obtain something. This is clearly reflected in his position, which we can disagree on. Mr. Trump's position on a host of global conflicts, including the war in Ukraine, shows that according to his vision, each side must make concessions. There is every reason to assume that this is what is happening now.

The fact remains that for the Bloc Québécois, and the independence movement in particular, trade and economic relations with the United States is of fundamental importance. That is based on a historical calculation. That was the bet made by the independence movement and its great economists, Jacques Parizeau and Bernard Landry, before they each became premier, in 1994 and 2001, respectively. Well before then, the question of free trade arose during the time of Brian Mulroney against a backdrop of U.S. protectionism. The United States Congress is after all very protectionist. President Reagan wanted to take advantage of a window to sign a free-trade agreement with Canada, and it was thanks to Quebec's and the independence movement's support that it came to pass.

Today we see that we may have gone too far in some respects, and that we were probably too dependent on free trade. Also, starting in the 1990s, we crossed the fine line between facilitating commercial trade and signing extremely restrictive agreements seeking a total commodification of life and elevating multinationals to the status of sovereign powers. We crossed that line, we went too far. This was our thinking at the time. We had just lost a referendum in 1980 because of economic fears, irrational fears in many ways, and the separatist movement decided that it would never again depend on the federal government's whims. We decided to never again be

Routine Proceedings

victims of federal blackmail and threats by prioritizing north-south trade rather than east-west trade. As we can see, that worked.

● (1245)

Today, the United States is Quebec's main trade partner. Some 12,000 Quebec companies do business with Uncle Sam. Among the many that stand out are Couche-Tard, Cascades, Hydro-Québec, CGI, Agropur, Saputo, Fruits d'Or and Miralis.

Almost 50% of Quebec's GDP is directly related to our exports. We are an export economy. Of these exports, 70% go to the United States, with approximately 10% going to New York in particular. It is also worth mentioning that many of our artists are much loved in the U.S. One of them is Robert Lepage. In short, it is undeniable that the United States is of capital importance for Quebec's economy.

What then do we do?

As I mentioned in my introduction, we must first realize that American power has changed. In the 1990s, the United States promoted globalization. When I say globalization, I do not just mean global trade. At the time, globalization was favoured as an approach that would create global institutions, almost a global society, as President Clinton's secretary of state openly said at the time.

That is no longer the case. After years and even decades of western naivete in the face of Chinese power, we began to notice that globalization was benefiting China rather than the United States, as had initially been the case. The wake-up call was brutal. In addition, the institutions created by the United States after World War II, like the World Bank and, in 1995, the World Trade Organization, began losing much of their power. We can see that today with the emergence of BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation. Regional blocs have begun to form, which means the end of American hegemony. We could even say that Washington is no longer interested in American hegemony. Today, Washington no longer wants to be a superpower or the global police. Washington has given up on that. I think that is the first thing we need to realize.

The United States never really bought into this happy globalization myth, either. At the time it was directly in line with their interests. Even Ronald Reagan, as pro-free trade as he was, introduced punitive tariffs on Japanese cars in the 1980s and played a leading role in repatriating the automobile industry to North America. It worked. When the balance of power is reconstituted and there is re-centralization toward regional blocks and away from a unipolar world dominated by a single country, we need to acknowledge that.

Routine Proceedings

We alone cannot change the world. We can exert a positive influence, and we can certainly make the best of the circumstances. This begins with a clear-eyed assessment of where things stand. No one country can rebuild a North American supply chain. The U.S. cannot do it alone. Mexico cannot do it alone. Canada cannot and Quebec cannot do it alone. All of us together, however, can.

Needless to say, there are many areas where the Americans will need us. For example, there is this one file in particular. It must be said that most of the trade irritants we might have with the United States could no doubt be resolved or lessened if everyone had a better understanding of their mutual interest. There is the matter of transportation electrification, for example. The U.S. passed the Inflation Reduction Act, which introduced tax credits. Contrary to Ottawa's claims, it is not true that all of the tax credits in the act apply to all North American production. They are truly misinformed if that is what they are asserting. I remember when President Biden made that claim right here. I saw members on the other side of the House rise in applause. It betrays a total lack of understanding, and certainly a failure to have even read it, because the 45X credit, for example, applies only to batteries assembled not in North America but in the United States. This poses a huge threat to our industries.

● (1250)

While nearly all of the battery factories will be built in China, a country that is mounting a powerful offensive to get its hands on critical minerals in nearly every corner of the world, it is only by acting together that North America can rise to the challenge. Also, while the United States is in the midst of a housing crisis, we have wood here. It seems to me that we have a good argument for ending the lumber crisis and the punitive tariffs on lumber. After 40 years, this has become background noise rather than breaking news. Further, I am not afraid to say that supply management is not only a model that is in our interests to defend. It is a model that the United States could take a page out of, as it guarantees food autonomy, land use and the development of our communities and our rural towns and villages.

There are some issues in which Canada has flagrantly failed, under governments of all stripes, which always favour the interests of other provinces over Quebec's. We saw that with the supply management issue in Canada's agreement with Europe. At the time, the Harper government decided to favour western beef. It was not interested in Quebec dairy production. By the way, western beef did not even make it to Europe, because the Europeans have a bunch of non-tariff measures in place. The same thing happened with the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The federal government had a choice. It could defend Ontario steel, Quebec aluminum or both. Obviously, it chose to defend Ontario steel with its formula requiring the use of 70% North American steel, but 70% North American aluminum parts. That meant that Chinese and Indian dumping in Mexico could continue. These countries could export liquid, cast or smelted aluminum, and Mexico could then use it to make parts. That way, the parts were technically made in North America. That is called dumping.

At the time, we pointed out that there was dumping going on and that aluminum had not been given the same status as steel. At first, the federal government said we were wrong. To borrow a phrase from my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent, the government was

“burying its head in the ostrich”. The government denied that it was applying a double standard. It did acknowledge it later, because of the agreement with the Bloc Québécois promising that, if dumping were observed, the agreement would be reopened and they would get equivalent status. It is the same thing with the United States and Mexico. They all ended up acknowledging the dumping.

Setting aside all of these issues on which the federal government always leans away from Quebec, just like the Supreme Court, which Maurice Duplessis once compared to the Tower of Pisa, there are a bunch of issues on which where Washington is completely justified in demanding better from Ottawa. I have often talked with members of Congress. They are convinced that Chinese solar panels that are stopped at the U.S. border are simply sent to Canada instead, which has no problem letting them in. We saw the same thing happen with the screening of goods produced by forced labour coming from a single region, Xinjiang, the Uyghur region of China. The United States has seized billions of dollars in goods. At last count, Canada had not seized any at all. Apparently, we are now up to six shipments. That is far from where we should be.

● (1255)

The United States may have good reason to view Canada not as the 51st state, but more like China's backyard, with no control of its border. This relates not only to the issues that have been rightly raised about drug smugglers, street gangs and crime at the border, but also to the trade component when it comes to goods made with forced labour entering Canada.

In the March 2023 budget, the government specifically wrote that legislation would be introduced to “eradicate forced labour from Canadian supply chains” and to gain better control over the border by the end of 2023. We are at the end of 2024, and the budget tabled in March of this year made the same promise. It said that this would happen by the end of the year. All signs point to Parliament rising for Christmas today, yet there is still no whiff of any such bill.

It is no wonder that the Americans look at Canada in this light, since it proudly claims to be a postnational state. It also shows that the feds understand nothing about strategy and geopolitics. One needs to understand the domestic realm in order to understand the international realm, but Ottawa does not know the first thing about it.

The same is true when it comes to controlling and monitoring investments. The U.S. has extremely robust tools and laws to control and monitor investments. In contrast, Ottawa takes a laissez-faire approach. The choice is therefore as follows. We realize that a new president is about to take office, and Canada might have a new prime minister. We will have to wait and see. However, we understand and want to emphasize that we need an election, because Ottawa has no legitimacy as far as Washington is concerned right now. Things are about to get rough in the next little while, and we have an extremely fragile government.

As a Quebec separatist, I think Quebec understands what economic nationalism is all about. Since the 1960s, it has been developing its own strategic levers, strategic legislation and organizations like Hydro-Québec, the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec and Investissement Québec. An independent Quebec will be an infinitely better bet on the world stage and in the realm of international geopolitics than a postnational Canada could ever be.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened quite attentively, particularly to the geopolitical lens my colleague put on the issue. I do not disagree with him on a lot of what he said, in particular about a North America plan or what Canada's role is in that as it relates to the United States and Mexico.

In the last round of negotiations with the Americans in what produced CUSMA, I am not sure if the member was in the House at the time, but the Conservatives were quite adamant at the time that we make a deal at all costs. The deal needed to come, and it needed to come immediately. We were staring down the barrel of tariffs. We had retaliatory tariffs on the U.S. It was very clear that all the Conservatives cared about was a deal, regardless, it seemed, of what was in it.

Does the member think that, if the Conservatives have the opportunity to negotiate that deal, they are going to be as successful as the government was last time?

• (1300)

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I do not think so, but I would say that there is definitely a difference. I would say that I agree with both sides. I think it is better to have a deal than no deal, but it is often better to have no deal than a bad deal. That is clear. We agree with that.

I also think there may be a way out of this. Stakeholders in the U.S. do not seem to be unanimous on the softwood lumber issue. I am thinking in particular of the National Association of Home Builders, which says that tariffs drive up construction costs and do not work, that some Americans do not have a home and that something needs to be done.

That being said, I think we may need to diversify and transform the sector. We need to develop our domestic market and gradually reduce our dependence on the United States, but we also need to diversify our markets. Other potential markets exist, such as Europe, for example, or Asia minus China. The Indo-Pacific strategy may offer a way out, but of course, we also have to settle this issue with the U.S.

[English]

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, obviously my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam is very close to the American border and also has a very busy and important port.

I know that the government is going to make some announcements today about investments in the port, but I wonder if the member could share his experience around the loss of funding in

Routine Proceedings

policing around ports and the border over 10 years of the last two governments.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, when we speak of borders, that includes the ports. I am not that familiar with my colleague's riding, but auto theft has long been a major issue at the port of Montreal.

Clearly, the lack of surveillance is a problem. We have the same problem at the border, which is probably related to the problem at the ports.

[English]

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Madam Speaker, when we look at trade and the Americans, of course there are big deals. Seventy per cent of Canada's economy is tied to trade with the U.S. It is a big deal for Canadians. Of course, we want to look at other markets but we cannot ignore the Americans. We look at how to handle the Americans, and we talk about how we have become the third-largest trading partner to the Americans. Mexico is number one and China is number two.

The new American president is coming in, talking tough to Canada and acting like he does, but we do not have the Prime Minister standing up for Canada. It is actually the premiers. The premiers of Alberta, Ontario and Quebec have stood up either to talk tough to the Americans or to ensure we are taking care of the borders, which is in question.

Since we have premiers standing up where the weak Prime Minister is not, how much do we need a strong Prime Minister to stand up for Canada?

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, the fact that the provincial premiers are doing all the work may be a sign. First, it is certainly not making me reconsider my political viewpoint. Second, I think that the fact that the agreement inappropriately called "Confederation" states that international relations are the purview of the federal government says something. That being said, the only time Quebec and Ontario were able to have representatives involved in trade negotiations was in the discussions with the European Union. It was not perfect. As the Quebec representative, Pierre Marc Johnson, liked to say, it mostly happened in the hallways, where the official delegation was sweet-talked far more than in the negotiation room. Moreover, their participation happened not because the federal government wanted them there, but because the European Union demanded it.

Routine Proceedings

There should probably be far more opportunity and transparency when it comes to giving the provinces a role in international relations and the federal government's management of foreign affairs. That should be the strict minimum until Quebec is able to speak to the world with its own voice.

• (1305)

Mr. Louis-Philippe Sauvé (LaSalle–Émard–Verdun, BQ): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague talked about the participation of federated states in trade agreement negotiations, including Quebec's participation.

What would Quebec independence mean for our people in terms of having greater autonomy to negotiate trade agreements? How would that benefit Quebeckers?

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I think it goes without saying that we are always better off going into negotiations ourselves, 100% focused on our own interests. We should not have to fight tooth and nail to promote and protect little bits of our interests here and there. I gave a few examples. It is a good thing we were there to fight for aluminum, although a concrete change in the status of aluminum in the agreement would no doubt be the real victory. The same can be said of supply management. We are currently fighting to get the unelected Senate to take up this issue.

These issues would not come up if Quebec were independent. Of course, as in any negotiation, sometimes we might make concessions, experience setbacks or send bad negotiators. Independence also means making our own mistakes. However, the blame would be ours and ours alone. We would not be an ultra-minority, always fighting for a little corner of the blanket to keep us warm, which is what we are constantly doing in the Canadian system.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on the exchange that the member and I had a few moments ago, because in response to that, he talked about diversifying our portfolio, for lack of a better expression, of trading partners. I could not agree more.

The Conservatives, and we heard it from the member for Bay of Quinte, seem to be hung up on the fact that the United States has so much trade with Mexico and China. I think it is important for us to be diversified, which is why the government has signed more trade deals. It is why we have a trade deal with the European Union and why we have a trade deal with Ukraine, which the member for Bay of Quinte actually voted against.

I am wondering if the member can talk more about the importance of diversification, because we do not want to put ourselves, to the best of our ability, in a situation where we are so dependent on one country. We need that diversification, which is why, if we are going to be a trading nation, it is in our best interests to have as many trading agreements with as many partners as possible, in my opinion.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, it is a very simple principle. The less we depend on one country, the better off we are. There may be ups and downs. At the moment, we are

talking about the United States, but, no matter which partner we are talking about, when we put all our eggs in one basket, we make ourselves vulnerable to this kind of situation, as we saw in 2019 when China decided to halt all imports of Canadian pork.

Regarding the agreement with Ukraine, I voted in favour of it, as did my colleagues. I would have opposed Conservative amendments during the committee's study. Some members wanted to include arms sales in a trade agreement. I saw that as an extremely dangerous possibility. Nevertheless, I did not agree with those amendments being ruled out of order, even though I was against them.

When we are kept in the dark during negotiations and are forced to vote on a finished product once talks are over and we cannot change anything or amend anything, that is a transparency issue. Plus, we have to vote on legislation to implement the agreement, not on the agreement itself. In other words, we have to take the finished product as is. It is a take-it-or-leave-it situation.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand today in the House to discuss the second report of the Standing Committee on International Trade and the related recommendations.

To begin with, I must say that the NDP has always favoured appropriate international trade. We have always found this extremely important. The NDP has played a key role in international trade by analyzing all the trade agreements we sign and by making sure that they serve the interests of Canadians. Unfortunately, if we look for example at the softwood lumber agreement signed by the Harper administration, we see that it was devastating for the softwood lumber industry in Canada. We lost 100,000 jobs.

We cannot rely on the Conservatives. They have a truly disastrous record in this area. They made bad deals, agreements that were not thought through and that undermine Canadian sovereignty. We will not take any lessons from the Conservatives. Even if they started the debate, they spent only minutes on it. The Conservatives did not have enough content to make a 10-minute speech on international trade.

When we talk about electric vehicles and green energy on the one hand, and when we see how poorly international trade is managed on the other hand, we see how badly the Conservatives botched the job when they were in power.

Routine Proceedings

The Liberals are a bit better, but not much. A little later on I am going to address their ignorance in terms of where we should invest. For example, we lost almost 1,200 of the border officers charged with protecting our borders. The Liberals just replaced a little more than a third of all the jobs lost under Stephen Harper. In nine years, the government replaced one-third of what we needed. This shows a lack of will to make all the necessary investments in international trade.

Also, we see how much green energy advanced under the Biden administration. U.S. cities and states are demanding clean energy only. Unfortunately, the Harper regime's record was disastrous, and the current government has not invested in recovering the losses we sustained after 10 years under Harper. Today we are in a situation where we are not creating as many jobs as we should with clean energy and with everything that needs to be done.

Although I cannot mention whether he is in the House or not, my colleague from Timmins—James Bay played a key role in finally getting a bill passed that advocated for clean energy, green energy and good union jobs. I know how difficult it was. The Conservatives blocked it at every turn in order to prevent us from having good, green, unionized jobs. I just want to acknowledge the important work done by my colleague from Timmins—James Bay. The entire NDP caucus supported him during the months that the Conservatives blocked everything to prevent this bill from being passed. Now it has passed. Unfortunately, the Liberals are not making the investments so we can start seeing these good jobs. That is a huge problem with this government.

We saw the chaos yesterday, and it continues today.

● (1310)

We saw the chaos yesterday, and it continues today. The government does not seem to understand the importance of implementing strategies and making investments to create jobs.

[*English*]

I mentioned my colleague from Timmins—James Bay because of the terrific work he did on that bill, but I want to underscore that the NDP's approach is quite different from that of the other parties. The Liberals have been lax, we have to say, in terms of border security and investments in international trade. We got the bill through that allows for clean energy investments and good unionized jobs, and the Liberals have done virtually nothing to make the investments in that bill, which was put in place under the leadership of my colleague from Timmins—James Bay with the collaboration of the labour movement. The work was done, and the Liberals have, again, dropped the ball on this. This is one of the reasons Canada is not creating the jobs that it could create by making those meaningful investments.

I will come back to the CBSA cuts because that is another example of how short-sighted both the Conservative government and the Liberal government have been over the last 20 years. Under the Conservatives, we saw massive cuts to CBSA frontline agents along the border, who protect the longest undefended border in the world. It is a border that needs to be protected, and we need to make those investments. The Conservatives, under Stephen Harper, while cutting, slicing and dicing pensions, health care and services

for people, and while destroying veterans services in the most egregious and profoundly disrespectful way possible, were also cutting border protection agents. CBSA agents protect us and our border, ensuring that the border is not porous and that there is a strategy for security in place. The Harper Conservatives killed nearly 1,200 frontline jobs. It is unbelievable that they would do that.

In that same way, they slashed veterans services and forced seniors to work years along. It was the most mean-spirited and corrupt government in Canadian history. Conservatives have never apologized for their years in power when they did all of those destructive things. A Conservative MP has never apologized to border officers across the country for axing 1,200 jobs. Not a single Conservative MP has apologized to veterans for axing veterans services in the most cruel way, denying tens of thousands of Canadian veterans even a proper burial. It is unbelievable how mean-spirited the Conservatives were. They have never apologized for axing health care or for forcing seniors to work two years longer.

We would think that, in this debate, since they provoked it, they would take the opportunity to at least apologize for gutting our border security. Issues are coming up around the Trump tariffs. This is real and will have a dramatic impact. It could threaten hundreds of thousands of jobs. Conservatives have never apologized for, or admitted to, creating the problem when they slashed those jobs so long ago, and they were wrong to do that. The Liberals have never apologized for not fully restoring the jobs that were cut. Liberals will say that they went a third of the way, but that is not enough. An NDP government would restore those positions and would make sure that we would have adequate border security in place across the country.

The second report from the Standing Committee on International Trade also deals with softwood lumber. I want to come back to the softwood lumber issue because it is very relevant in this day and age. It is coming back. We have legitimate concerns about what is going to happen to the softwood lumber sector. We know that the Conservatives have the worst record in history, in Canada, in terms of softwood lumber. I was a new member of Parliament when Stephen Harper took control and the Harper regime was put in place. Canada had actually won in every trade tribunal, at every single level, and had just one final hurdle, one final trade tribunal decision that would have given Canada a complete victory.

● (1315)

This is known to people from across the country, people in softwood communities across the country, including in my province of British Columbia. A number of my family members have worked in the softwood industry. We know softwood. Yet despite the fact that we were so close to the finish line, winning that final victory that would have allowed unimpeded trade across the United States, the Harper regime snatched defeat from the jaws of victory.

Routine Proceedings

Instead of going to that final decision, which would have been the ultimate victory for softwood lumber, there was the Harper government's ineptitude and inability even to understand basic governing functions. Conservatives tend to be extremely superficial when they are in government. I will come back to that in a moment. In this case, it was just complete ineptitude that led to the softwood lumber sellout. Rather than finalizing that final trade tribunal judgment, which would have given Canada complete and total victory, that decision, that ineptitude, that inability to even understand the industry, led to the giving up of a billion dollars of money from the softwood industry. It led to the loss of 100,000 jobs.

I fought in the House, along with my colleagues, against the softwood lumber sellout. Tragically, Liberals allied themselves with Conservatives for reasons that they have never explained. The loss of jobs was catastrophic, with mills closing across British Columbia and across Canada. The major industry players started investing in the United States because they did not trust the Harper regime to actually put in place any sort of protections for the Canadian industry. As a result of that, we bled a 100,000 jobs. There were 100,000 families that lost their breadwinners. It was devastating to communities right across the country as the mills shut down. It was not that Canada had any reason to concede to the United States, but that the Harper regime, in its incredible ineptitude, being mean-spirited and incompetent in the worst possible combination, just decided that it would do a press conference and concede everything. It gave up a billion dollars, 100,000 jobs and over 200 mills across the country.

Not a single Conservative MP has ever apologized for that devastation in the industry. Not a single Conservative MP has ever stood in the House and said that they were sorry to the hundred thousand families that lost their breadwinners, that they were sorry to the 200 communities that lost mills, that they were sorry for the billion dollars that they gave away because they were so inept and incompetent that they did not understand they were so close to that final trade tribunal victory.

This is why Canadians can never trust Conservatives. It is not only the mean-spiritedness of Conservatives and the Conservative philosophy, but also the sheer incompetence of Conservatives when they are governing. I mentioned earlier how Conservatives govern. We have seen in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario how they govern health care systems.

The worst health care outcomes in the country are in Conservative provinces. They have the worst waiting lists and the longest lineups in emergency wards. After a bicycle accident a few weeks ago, I had to go to Ottawa's Civic hospital and had a 14-hour wait in the emergency ward, with many of the people in pain and suffering. The Conservatives in power in Ontario do not seem to care about that.

Conservatives in Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta do not care about the fact that they have profoundly worse health outcomes than, for example, in British Columbia and in Manitoba, which are NDP provinces, where there have been investments made in the health care sector. As a result of that, we see much better health outcomes.

When Conservatives govern, whether we are talking about international trade or any other issue, they make a mess of things. They

are not good at managing programs. They are not good at managing public health care. They are not good at managing education. They are not good at making the kinds of investments that make a difference. The real kicker here is that they are terrible at managing money. This is the thing that strikes so many Canadians across the country when we look at Conservative governments.

● (1320)

The fiscal period returns actually show how both provincial governments and federal governments manage Canada's money. New Democrats have not yet formed a federal government, but we have formed provincial governments. The fiscal period returns compiled by the federal Ministry of Finance over the last 40 years, which is not a hotbed of New Democrats so it is quite obvious this is impartial and non-partisan, have revealed that NDP governments are best at managing money. The worst at managing money are Conservatives. Why is that?

We can just look at the Harper regime. The billion dollars it gave away on the softwood lumber sellout is just one example. The Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed something else in 2019, which is that the series of overseas tax havens, the notorious, infamous tax haven treaties signed by Harper, now bleed out of this country each and every year more than \$30 billion.

The corporations are very profitable ones, with very wealthy individuals who can take their money out, which is tax money. It is money that belongs to all of us and that could be providing better pensions for seniors and better health care. It could be ensuring that we are investing in jobs and could provide benefits for people with disabilities. It could ensure all those things.

Under Harper, there were sellout infamous tax treaties with notorious overseas tax havens. People can even look them up; it is not like this is something hidden. The entities are often on blacklists in terms of laundering money and being tax havens, and yet Harper and the Harper regime repeatedly signed agreements with them. The net result is over \$30 billion each and every year.

When we look at the billion dollars Conservatives gave away on softwood lumber and at the \$30 billion they gave away each and every year of their being in power, we see the incredible ineptitude of Conservatives when they actually try to manage money. They also provided remarkable support for Canada's big banks to beef up profits and dividends: \$116 billion in liquidity support. Not a single Conservative MP has ever apologized for that. Where did they take the money from? They took it from CMHC, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and made sure the banks received the money, instead of it going to people who actually wanted to access affordable housing.

Routine Proceedings

The history of Conservatives in power is that they are incompetent when it comes to managing the nation's money. They will give massive amounts to overseas tax havens, to the banks and to oil and gas CEOs, tens of billions of dollars. If we look at the cumulative amount, it is hundreds of billions of dollars that they will give away, but they will not fund health care, pensions and veterans services, and they will not fund having border officers across the country to actually make sure our country is kept safe. They certainly will not fund things like a final trade tribunal decision that actually means that Canada wins and that our softwood lumber industry can maintain the 100,000 jobs Conservatives cost us.

There are Conservatives, who have a terrible record. There are Liberals, who have been very nonplussed in their governing; they have not done nearly as much as they should have. Then there is an NDP caucus that is ready, under the leadership of the MP for Burnaby South, to actually make this country work effectively, to make sure the investments are made, to close all the tax loopholes so big corporations and the wealthiest among us actually pay their fair share of taxes, and to invest in things like international trade and jobs, ensuring clean energy, prosperity and unionized jobs across the country.

That is the difference and is eventually what Canadians will choose. We know the election is next year, and we will be fighting hard so they choose an NDP government.

• (1325)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as I read the report that we are studying before Parliament, a couple of things come to mind as they relate to Kings—Hants. One is that there is a significant forestry sector in our constituency. There is also the Michelin tire plant, and I think about the cross-border trade. I know there was a lot in the report about electric vehicles, but there is even the presence of Michelin tires, including the tires that are needed for electric vehicles.

The hon. member talked a lot about, and I thought he did a pretty good job outlining, some of the concerns around the Conservative agenda when they were in power, and I know we are in a bit of a tedious time right now as it relates to the relationship with the U.S. and the new incoming administration.

Would the member agree with me that part of the role of an opposition is to legitimately critique the government but not to gaslight and suggest things that are not true? Does he think that the way that the member for Carleton has been conducting his affairs is actually detrimental to Canada's position as it relates to Canada-U.S. relations?

• (1330)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I outlined the terrible Conservative record on forestry and softwood lumber; it was just a terrible sellout that costs so many jobs, and there were CBSA cuts as well. Obviously those have an impact right across the border.

My point to the member would be that Liberals should have fully restored the things the Conservative cut. They partially restored things, but they could have gone further. As far as the member for Carleton goes, he is not even capable of undergoing or willing to

undergo a security screening, and he does not seem capable of offering or even willing to offer any policy on international trade.

It is quite compelling to me that Conservatives put forward the concurrence motion and then could not even fill their 10 minutes. They had nothing to say: nothing to say about international trade, about the Trump tariffs, about the hundreds of thousands of potentially lost jobs, about their CBSA cuts and about their softwood lumber sellout.

Why do Conservatives have nothing to say on something that is so important to Canadians?

Mr. Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby spoke about health care, and he talked about how NDP provinces seem to be prospering. I would like to know what his perspective is on the NDP governments that, when they were in power in Saskatchewan, shut down 52 hospitals and care centres. What are his thoughts on that?

I would also like to ask my colleague what his thoughts are on the fact that there is only one taxpayer and that the carbon tax is being downloaded onto provinces, which is affecting school boards, hospitals and municipalities.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, first off, in terms of health care and specifically health care outcomes, I have just outlined that the provinces with the worst health care outcomes, the longest waiting lists and the most difficulty in getting into emergency wards are Conservative provinces, including his own. Those provinces are Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Conservatives can take a lesson from this.

The member does not have to ask me; he can ask the people of Regina and Saskatoon. When they had a choice between electing a Conservative government or the Saskatchewan New Democrats, every single seat in Regina went NDP. Every seat in Saskatoon except one went NDP. Therefore he should be talking to the people of Saskatchewan, because they rejected the Conservative government in Saskatchewan. That is why in Saskatoon and Regina, of the dozens of seats, there is only one Conservative, who won by a handful of votes.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have enormous respect for my colleague, but I do have to correct the record. He said that the member who lives in a 19-room mansion, Stornoway, has never put forward any legislative agenda. I have been here for 20 years and he has put forward one; it was against vaccines. I note that because we know how many of his backbenchers believe that vaccines are some kind of George Soros conspiracy.

Routine Proceedings

However, it is not a joke, because Robert Kennedy, Jr.'s key lawyer has now just pushed to get rid of the polio vaccine, and there is a guy who has no life experience and who lives in a 19-room mansion who is pushing against basic health care protections, in order to feed his QAnon base and his QAnon backbenchers.

I would like to ask the member what he thinks about the threat being posed by attacking something as basic as the polio vaccine.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague from Timmins—James Bay, which is why I praised his work for clean energy a few minutes ago.

The Conservatives seem to have three-word slogans, and one of them apparently is “Bring back polio.” It is just unbelievable to me that Conservatives would campaign across the country with the idea of making Canada great for polio again. Polio is a serious disease that leads to lifelong disabilities, yet Conservatives are campaigning against vaccines. I do not know why Conservatives would campaign on bringing back polio, diphtheria, measles and all the diseases that have thankfully been put aside because of vaccines and by investments in health care infrastructure.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Philippe Sauvé (LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, BQ): Madam Speaker, the patterns and wood finishes in the House of Commons remind me a lot of crutches. At St. Joseph's Oratory, there is a long row of crutches for the miraculously cured. In Parliament, there is a crutch that is always there to save the government. That crutch is the New Democratic Party.

While the Liberal Party is in full-on crisis, I would like the member for New Westminster—Burnaby to tell me if his party is going to support the government in the next confidence vote. My colleague claims to be calling for the Prime Minister's head, but is he going to vote for or against a non-confidence motion in the government? This vote will have an impact on international trade.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I know my colleague's riding well. When I went door knocking in LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, people kept thanking me. They thanked the NDP for securing dental care. In that riding, nearly 4,000 people are receiving dental care now thanks to the NDP.

A person like Craig Sauvé, the municipal councillor there, champions the values of wanting to provide more services to Quebecers. The largest coalition in the history of Quebec also asked for pharmacare. This coalition asked that the NDP's pharmacare bill be adopted.

Will my colleague stand up for his constituents, who want the dental care and pharmacare that the NDP has provided?

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, like the member for Timmins—James Bay, I also have a lot of respect for the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, so I would like to offer a correction to him as well. Conservatives did actually talk a little this morning about this issue, but they focused the majority of their comments on celebrating their electoral win last night. It reminded me exactly who was elected last night; it was

somebody who in the chamber said the following during a debate on conversion therapy, when asking the member for Don Valley West, an openly gay man, a question about conversion therapy:

Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of the bones of the dead and everything unclean.

That is the quality of candidate the Conservatives put forward in last night's election. My question to the member is very simple. If he were to say something like that—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, there is a member abusing the House by taking photographs.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would ask the hon. member to delete the photographs he took.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Whether he is outside the House or not, if he is taking pictures of the House, he needs to—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. He needs to delete them. I am asking him to please delete them.

We are out of time for the question of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. It had been over a minute, so I will allow the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby to respond.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, those kinds of homophobic comments are absolutely unacceptable in the House, and I would certainly hope that if the member is coming back to this House, we would not see a repetition of those despicable, hateful, homophobic comments. I would hope Conservative members would stand in the House and apologize. There is no place for homophobia in the House of Commons of Canada.

• (1340)

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join this debate today, as chair of the Standing Committee on International Trade. I have to say we have a wonderful group of people on all sides on the committee who really work very well together. It is a privilege to have an opportunity to speak today, this being our last session before the House will rise, and to have a chance to wish everybody a very merry Christmas and a successful 2025.

We find ourselves at a moment in time when the relationship between Canada and the United States is more vital than ever. I want to take this opportunity to speak on a subject that has for decades, not just now, defined the success of our country in many ways: our enduring, deeply rooted relationship with our southern neighbour.

Routine Proceedings

Canada and the United States share a relationship that is clearly the envy of the whole world. We are the closest of allies, connected by a border that spans over 8,000 kilometres, linking us not only geographically but in terms of shared values, history and, of course, our shared culture. From trade to security, from environmental stewardship to technological innovation, our nations are inextricably linked in ways that shape not only our own prosperity but that of the world at large. The dynamic between our two countries is one of collaboration in many ways, mutual respect and a commitment to addressing the complex challenges of our time.

Before I forget to mention it, I am sharing my time with my hon. colleague from Kingston and the Islands. It is always interesting when he chooses to entertain all of us with his last 10 minutes.

In this ever-changing world, it is vital that we, as elected representatives of the Canadian people, uphold the integrity of this partnership. It is vitally important to all of us in the House and, frankly, to all Canadians, that we continue to work on that very issue.

The United States, as we know, is a country with an ever-shifting political landscape. Leadership changes, priorities evolve and, at times, the approach to our relationship with the U.S., as now, may seem a bit uncertain. In the face of these changes, we must remain steadfast in our commitment to protecting and nurturing the Canada-U.S. relationship. It is not just an option for Canada; it is imperative.

Let us be clear: This relationship is foundational to the well-being of every single Canadian. It is critical to our economy and to our security. We are hearing the issues raised around the border, so security is of major importance for all of us. This relationship is critical also to the social fabric that binds us together. Our relationship with the U.S. is the bedrock upon which our shared prosperity is built and the Liberal government has always recognized that, as do the previous governments in the U.S.

Let me take a moment to reflect on one of the most significant recent achievements of our government in terms of Canada-U.S. relations: the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. The agreement was originally signed in 1994 and had served its purpose well, facilitating the growth of trade and investment between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. However, the world has changed since 1994 and our economy has evolved. The global trade environment is now vastly different from what it was in 1994, and it has become clear that the old NAFTA, as we now refer to it, was no longer sufficient to meet the needs of our growing industries, workers and communities.

When the previous U.S. administration threatened to withdraw from NAFTA, we understood it was a critical moment. Canada could not allow the agreement to unravel without a fight, and fight we did. Under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, and the tireless efforts of our team of negotiators, including the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member mentioned the Prime Minister by name. She knows she is not to do that.

The hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek.

• (1345)

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, I am sorry. I will make sure I do not have that in my notes in the future.

I was also going to mention the former finance minister and the wonderful job she did on the negotiations at that time. I am sure she will be involved in the future as we renegotiate these agreements.

We knew our ability to secure a new agreement, one that would not only preserve but enhance our trading relationships, was paramount to Canada's future. The negotiations were intense and there were moments when it seemed our position would be tested to the limit. However, as always, we stood firm in defence of Canadian workers as a united Canada.

The voices of farmers and businesses were also heard and respected as that negotiation went on. We ensured that the environment and labour standards were prioritized, and we secured a modernized trade agreement, the Canada-United States-Mexico agreement, referred to as CUSMA, that is more than just a trade deal; it is a testament to our commitment to fair, rules-based trade. It is critically important for our future, the future of the U.S. and all of the people who work in both countries.

The CUSMA is a historic agreement that will benefit Canadians for generations to come, as we have seen. It preserves preferential access to the U.S. market while modernizing and expanding provisions on areas like digital trade, intellectual property and dispute resolution. It strengthens protections for our cultural industries, ensures better access to U.S. agricultural markets and provides new opportunity for Canadian businesses, especially small and medium-sized enterprises. It is a deal that clearly works for Canada and has worked for Canada for many years.

Some of my colleagues in the opposition may argue that the CUSMA is the result of mere luck or that it could have been negotiated differently, but they did not appear at the time. Let us be clear. This agreement is the result of tireless, strategic negotiations led by the Liberal government. We could have chosen to back down, or to accept a bad deal or no deal at all, but that is not the Canadian way and was not in the best interests of Canadian businesses. It was never an option for consideration. We knew what was at stake and we understood that Canada's future was clearly on the line. Our negotiating team, led by our former finance minister, stood firm and delivered.

This is what the Liberal government does. We stand up for Canada and Canadian interests, even when the road ahead is uncertain and challenging. The Liberal Party has a proven track record when it comes to ensuring Canada's interests are protected on the world stage, particularly in relation to the United States. We understand the complexities of this relationship and we know how to navigate the delicate balance of standing firm on our principles while maintaining a productive, co-operative dialogue with our American counterparts.

Routine Proceedings

We also know trade is not the only aspect of our relationship with the U.S. that demands our attention. The security of our citizens, our shared environmental challenges and the technological landscape are just a few of the other areas where co-operation with the U.S. is essential. In each of these areas, we have consistently demonstrated the ability to act in the best interests of all Canadians.

On security, Canada and the United States share one of the closest and most comprehensive defence relationships in the world. Our partnership through NORAD ensures our skies are protected and we work side by side to combat threats like terrorism and organized crime. Our intelligence-sharing agreements ensure we are prepared for any security challenge and we have consistently stood together in support of peace and stability around the globe.

On the environment, we share an obligation to protect our natural shared resources. We have committed to working closely with the U.S. on initiatives to combat climate change, reduce carbon emissions and ensure that both our countries transition to a greener, more sustainable future.

I am thankful for the opportunity to comment on behalf of our trade and all of our colleagues.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, we are talking about trade and yet the Conservatives are acting like sock puppets for the narcissist in Mar-a-Lago. They will repeat any falsehood he says because they think it will score them points.

We need a vision of a nation at this time that stands taller than this high school cafeteria, juvenile behaviour because the threat of 25% tariffs is very serious. Our leader has offered the very challenged front bench the idea of a war room, of bringing together business and labour leaders, leaders from across the country, so we have a unified position. Otherwise, we are standing here looking like fools while the guy down in Mar-a-Lago is pushing us around.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague what she thinks.

• (1350)

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge that my hon. colleague has contributed tremendously to the House. He has made the debates in this House very interesting and quite comical at times.

Certainly, we have put together the Canada-U.S. team of negotiators who are working already, 18 hours a day, on a variety of areas of strength and opportunities that we have to negotiate further with. We have a lot of positive things to offer and we know how to retaliate when necessary.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. I enjoyed serving with her on the trade committee.

We talk about what Canada needs when it comes to trade. We talk about leverage or strength. We talk often on this side about the weakness that comes from the current government and Prime Minister in taking on a very strong American counterpart. When we look at that, there are three things we need to see right away. Number one is to axe the carbon tax, which is putting an undue burden on a lot of our businesses, making them uncompetitive. Number

two is to scrap the cap on emissions in oil and gas, which is our number one export and, of course, drives growth into Canada. Number three is to make sure we are Canada first when we look at defending our borders and when it comes to meeting our 2% NATO commitment, which builds up our military for us.

Does the member agree that we need to look at Canada first for all Canadians, for always?

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, I want thank my colleague who is the vice-chair of the international trade committee. He is doing a fine job and we work well together.

At the end of the day, it is about Canada first all the time, for all of us. All of us in the House have the same destination, to make sure we are doing things.

When it comes to the whole issue of climate change, the Liberal Party of Canada has a plan. I would ask anybody to look at the news, even last night, in spite of all the other things that were on the news. We talked about the amount of destruction happening around the world because of climate change. I believe we have a path forward that will work to try to change the conditions the world is facing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to take advantage of what is likely my last speech in the House this year to wish everyone a merry Christmas. With that out of the way, I want to say that my colleague's speech is important. Approximately 80% of our exports to the United States are raw materials. The United States needs this raw material to process it.

Would it not make sense to invest in processing our own raw materials and develop our economy that way? My dream is to see processing happen near the Abitibi-Témiscamingue mine, particularly for strategic critical minerals. I dream of seeing a Quebec IKEA built near La Sarre so that we can actually process our wood instead of just sending our two-by-fours and lumber to the United States. That would create wealth and protect our economy.

What does the member think about that?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his best wishes.

Certainly, we recognize the value of our lumber, our minerals and all of the very sacred items we have in Canada that help to keep our country strong and open more opportunities for all of our businesses as we move forward.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to this concurrence motion. It appears as though we will end this parliamentary session the same way we started it, which was with Conservative gimmicks and antics.

Statements by Members

For those who are just tuning in today, the Conservatives moved a concurrence motion that had been sitting on the table for quite a while, and then they proceeded to put a number of amendments to it. The unfortunate reality for Conservatives is that all of the amendments they put forward have dates on them in early January, and unfortunately we will not even get to vote on this until the House resumes in late January. I guess we can chalk this one up as a loss for the Conservatives in that they were not successful in their antics today.

However, I found it very interesting when the member for New Westminster—Burnaby made the comment earlier that the Conservatives put forward this concurrence motion, yet none of them wanted to talk about it. We had two Conservative members get up to speak to this motion, and the first, the member for Caledon, took all of his time congratulating Tamara Jansen, the new—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Anybody else want to—

• (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. One would hope that MPs would be behaving themselves. Christmas is coming, and I am sure that Santa has been taking note of the disorder here in the House. He is going to save himself a lot of trips this year.

The hon. deputy government House leader.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I am happy to go out the same way that I came in, in September, which is with Conservatives heckling me. I am happy to leave for the break on the same terms.

Just for those in the gallery and perhaps those who are watching this right now, all of those cheers that we just heard from Conservatives were in support of a former colleague who used to sit in the House. Do Canadians know what that colleague said during a debate on conversion therapy? This is what she said, in asking the member for Don Valley West a question about conversion therapy after his debate. She quoted scripture and said:

Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of the bones of the dead and everything unclean.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the calibre of candidate that the Conservative Party of Canada puts up today. That is who is put on the ticket for the Conservatives. For those who might wonder what a Conservative future government could look like for the LGBTQ community, they need look no further than the results of last night's election.

I was trying to ask the member for New Westminster—Burnaby a question earlier, specifically about what would happen in his caucus if one of their MPs had done that. I can tell the House that, if a member of the Liberal Party had made a comment like that and it was not immediately retracted—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have a point of order from the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

I hope that members will be quiet, because I know that the hon. deputy government House leader can speak quite loudly, but I am having a hard time hearing him because of the disorder.

The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, the tone of the member for Kingston and the Islands as he is quoting scripture is nothing more than anti-Christian bigotry—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): This is actually a point of debate. It is not a point of order.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay is also rising on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, as someone who was an altar boy, I find it very offensive that people use witch burners as examples of what Christians should be.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): These are not points of order. They are points of debate.

The hon. deputy government House leader has one minute before I interrupt him.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, all I was saying is that, if somebody in the Liberal Party had said that, and I am sure in the NDP and most likely in the Bloc Québécois too, not only would they not be allowed to run in a future election under our banner, but they would probably be immediately removed from caucus.

That is not the Conservatives though. They embrace individuals who teach, preach and participate in the act of conversion therapy, and they have no problem with going after a marginalized community, a community that needs the support of Canadians, a community such as the LGBTQ community, which this side of the House will always stand with.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member ended his speech before I interrupted him, so he will have five minutes of questions and comments the next time this matter is before the House.

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings on the motion at this time. Accordingly, the debate on the motion will be rescheduled for another sitting.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone and wish everyone a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

[*English*]

To my constituents and to all in the House, I am wishing you a great holiday season and that you are safe.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CHRISTIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I stand today to advocate for fairness, unity and recognition.

Statements by Members

Christianity, embraced by millions of Canadians, has shaped the moral and cultural fabric of our great nation. Many of Canada's foundational values, institutions and traditions reflect Christian principles. We have months dedicated to Sikh, Islamic, Jewish and Hindu heritage, but there is no such recognition for the Christian faith.

December, a month already steeped in Christian traditions of hope and giving, is the perfect time to honour this legacy. Let us celebrate the values, contributions and diversity Christianity has brought to Canada and to mankind. I urge the government to designate December as Christian heritage month.

I wish everyone a merry Christmas and a very happy, healthy and prosperous new year.

* * *

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with Christmas, Christians celebrate the hope and love that God provides through the birth of his son, Jesus Christ, who lived, died and rose again so that we could choose his free gift of eternal life beginning right here on earth.

When I was accused of allowing my Christian faith to impact how I engage in this place, my response was that everyone in this place has faith. The difference between us is where and in whom we put that faith. Secularism seeks to conduct human affairs without religious involvement, expunging the values and morals of those who believe in God from the public square. This is contrary to the intent of the term “separation of church and state”. On January 1, 1802, Thomas Jefferson penned a letter assuring a specific church community that it is the church that is protected from state control under the First Amendment. In Canada, our Canadian Bill of Rights and Charter of Rights and Freedoms protect the church from state interference.

Wherever someone chooses to place their faith, I wish them a heart full of thankfulness and wonderful memories with family and friends during this Christmas season.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the last parliamentary sitting day of the year.

Federal investments are laying the foundation for a healthy and sustainable community in Brampton South. That includes over \$26.2 million for energy-efficient retrofits and the creation of a youth hub at the Susan Fennell Sportsplex. Millions of dollars have been committed to develop and enhance public transit, parks and fitness centres across the riding.

We recently marked one year of the Canada dental care plan. Already more than three million Canadians have been approved for coverage, including nearly 5,000 from Brampton South. Pharmacare is going to help 3.7 million Canadians living with diabetes get free medication, and the upcoming device fund will help them get access to the equipment they need.

I am truly proud of the work we did in 2024 for Canadians. With that, I would like to wish everyone in Brampton and across Canada happy holidays and a happy new year in 2025.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TABLEÉ POPULAIRE

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today's lunch was the most beautiful meal of the year in Drummondville, as a hearty traditional Christmas dinner was offered to Tableé populaire regulars by the team at the legendary Le Roy Jucep restaurant, where, as we all know, poutine was invented.

This is the third year that Laurent Proulx and Léonie Nadeau have invited local politicians and business people to help their generous team by becoming servers for a day. It is hard to put into words just how special this moment is, not only for those who are being pampered, since these are people who do not have it easy in general, but also for those who are coming together to offer a moment of happiness to the less fortunate. A total of 120 meals were served today, 120 meals that brought a smile to someone's face, put a little twinkle in their eyes, or warmed their heart.

I would like to thank Laurent and Léonie for highlighting the indispensable mission of the Tableé populaire through their generous gift, which shows that Drummondville's got heart. We have a heart, and it is in the right place.

* * *

[*English*]

HOLIDAY GREETINGS

Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the holiday season approaches, I want to share my holiday greetings and gratitude with my constituents in Richmond Centre.

This holiday season in Richmond, we celebrate the diversity and the richness of our shared culture, where Canadians from all backgrounds come together to share this holiday joy with one another. As we celebrate the holidays, let us reflect on the importance of family, compassion and the connection that unites us all. This year's holiday season is extra special for Canadians. With a GST tax break for the holidays, we are helping everyone focus on what matters most: spending time with family and friends.

To my constituents in Richmond Centre and all Canadians, I extend my warmest wishes for a joyous holiday season and a happy new year. May this holiday season bring peace, hope and happiness to everyone.

• (1405)

[Translation]

MONIQUE VÉZINA

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we were deeply saddened yesterday to learn of the passing of a former Conservative MP and minister. Monique Vézina was an exceptional woman who left a lasting mark on Quebec and all of Canada.

Elected in 1984 as the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata, Mrs. Vézina became a vital player in Brian Mulroney's Progressive Conservative government. She held key roles, including Minister for External Relations and International Development and Minister responsible for La Francophonie. Throughout her career, Mrs. Vézina was a true pioneer. She had a passion for improving the lives of women and seniors, while paving the way for countless women in politics.

Her legacy goes well beyond her political accomplishments. Mrs. Vézina also contributed to the social and cultural vitality of the Lower St. Lawrence, her home region, by inspiring future generations with her dedication and her vision.

My thoughts are with her family, friends and loved ones, as well as all those who were lucky enough to meet her and witness her leadership. A remarkable woman has left us, but her influence and memory will stay with us forever.

* * *

[English]

HOLIDAY GREETINGS

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we come to the end of another session, I am delighted to wish neighbours in my riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills and all Canadians a very happy holiday season. This is a time for reflection and gratitude, a time to celebrate the values that unite us in kindness, hope and the spirit of generosity. We also recognize that, for many, this time of year can be challenging, and it is crucial that we come together to support one another.

I want to express my sincere thanks to my incredible team, whose hard work and commitment continue to make a positive impact in our community. We have made progress this year, and we are ready to work even harder in the new year to support the people of Mississauga—Erin Mills and all Canadians.

I wish members in the House and all Canadians a very merry Christmas, happy Hanukkah and all the joy of the season.

* * *

ELEVATION TO CARDINAL

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Eglinton—Lawrence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to His Eminence Cardinal Francis Leo of the Archdiocese of Toronto, who was recently elevated by Pope Francis to the College of Cardinals in the Vatican.

Born as an Italian Canadian in Montreal, Cardinal Leo's vocational service has been rooted in compassion, love and inclusion. His advocacy for truth and reconciliation, the LGBTQ+ community

Statements by Members

and the vulnerable has been a force for good within the Catholic Church. Cardinal Leo is also a champion for education, including the integration of indigenous history within educational programs across Catholic institutions. This represents a hopeful direction for the Catholic Church to foster mutual trust and healing.

Cardinal Leo said that, when he heard about his elevation to the College of Cardinals, his phone “lit up like a Christmas tree”. It may have been an early gift from the Pope, but the true present is Cardinal Leo's service to his community. May his tenure inspire hope, love and renewal within the Church and beyond.

Auguri e buon natale.

* * *

• (1410)

MEMBER FOR CLOVERDALE—LANGLEY CITY

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating Tamara Jansen on her by-election victory last night. The people of Cloverdale—Langley City have sent a powerful message to the Prime Minister and his partner, the leader of the NDP. The only question we must ask is whether they are listening.

After nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, housing prices and rents have doubled; people struggle to afford food and heating. The Prime Minister has lost control of the border, immigration and, now, our finances. Following his former finance minister's departure, the Prime Minister hobbles along only with the support of his former babysitter for adult supervision.

Recently, in Halifax, the Prime Minister referred to “the moment when Canadians actually get to make a choice about the kind of country we are and the kind of solutions we are going to put forward in the coming years”. Last night, the people spoke clearly. They rejected a government that denies citizens their democratic right to choose who can best lead us through these times of turmoil.

Canadians need and deserve a carbon tax election. I am calling on the NDP leader to stop his shameful propping up of the Prime Minister, who is way past his best-before date. We need an election now.

* * *

CHRISTMAS ON THE HILL

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I was honoured to host Christmas on the Hill. We welcomed constituents with heartfelt personal reflections and joyous music from the All Nations Full Gospel Church Ottawa choir. We shared the warmth of the Christmas spirit, spoke about the importance of caring for others and celebrated the birth of Jesus. I also had the opportunity to formally introduce my motion, Motion No. 171, to designate December as Canadian Christian month.

Statements by Members

I want to wish my fellow parliamentarians and Canadians from coast to coast, especially residents of my riding of Scarborough—Agincourt, the happiest of holidays, a happy Hanukkah, a happy Kwanzaa and a very merry Christmas.

* * *

SEASON'S GREETINGS

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Mr. Speaker,

T'is the week before Christmas, and all through this House
MPs dream of returning to home, hearth and spouse
Our stockings are hung by our chimneys with care
But what of the homeless? Who put them out there?
There's fingers to point and random people to blame
But, mostly, I think of one person I'd name
And that's Rideau Cottage's middle-aged Swifty
Who, through taxes, inflation and budgets unthrifty
Has crushed housing starts and caused rents to double.
Perhaps, in the end, he's one source of our trouble?
His modest proposal to ease Canada's pain
Reads like Jonathan Swift: no more tax on champagne!
But, what if instead we stopped taxing new houses
Might that build more homes for our kids and their spouses?
If housing officials weren't paid to say "No"
Would that cause the supply of housing to grow?
If that can be true, then of hope there's a token
That Canada soon will be much less broken.

* * *

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is only one person keeping the Prime Minister in power and that is the leader of the NDP. The sellout leader of the NDP is not concerned about Canadians. He is concerned only with keeping the Liberals in power long enough so that he qualifies for his pension. The Liberal-NDP coalition has doubled housing prices, doubled rent and has driven up the cost of groceries, yet the NDP continues to support the carbon tax, voting for it over 24 times.

The costly coalition plans to quadruple the tax, further driving up the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. Canadians who once gave to food banks are now lining up at those same food banks to just get by. Liberal MPs and Liberal cabinet ministers have stated that they have no confidence in the Prime Minister. The Conservatives and the Bloc have no confidence in the Prime Minister. Who does? The leader of the NDP does, counting down the days to secure his pension. The NDP should grant Canadians their Christmas gift and grant us a carbon tax election.

* * *

● (1415)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on November 30, our government signed the first-ever modern treaty with the Métis government, the Manitoba Métis Federation. It was a historic day of celebration, reflection and progress, a day that honoured Louis Riel and all that he fought and gave his life for. This achievement would not have been possible without the exceptional leadership of President David Chartrand, the greatest Métis leader since Riel.

Today we acknowledge the pivotal role of the Red River Métis in bringing the Province of Manitoba into Confederation. Today we recognize the rights and self-government of the Red River Métis Nation, as well as affirm our commitment to reconciliation and collaboration.

Working together, this agreement demonstrates the power of partnership, benefiting everything from housing to health care to cultural preservation. Finally, I want to acknowledge Canada's Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and the Minister of Northern Affairs, who worked tirelessly to move this treaty forward, marking a victory for the Red River Métis Nation, for Manitoba and for Canada.

Marsi.

* * *

SEASON'S GREETINGS

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as this year comes to a close, I want to take a moment and send my warmest wishes to everyone in Edmonton Strathcona and across Canada this holiday season. As we wrap up 2024, a year that was full of challenges, I want to celebrate the amazing people of Edmonton Strathcona. Our community is full of people who volunteer, who support one another, who work together to make our community stronger. Each one makes Edmonton Strathcona special, vibrant and resilient. I am so grateful for all that they do.

The holidays are a time to rest, reconnect and recharge, so whether people are celebrating with family, sharing laughter with friends, spending time with our neighbours or just taking a moment to breathe, I hope that this season brings joy, warmth and some well-deserved holiday cheer. Let us make 2025 a brighter, fairer and kinder year in our community together. From my family to theirs, I wish everyone a merry Christmas, a happy Hanukkah, a blessed Kwanza and a very happy new year. Stay warm, stay safe and we will see each other in 2025.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DARLLIE PIERRE-LOUIS

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to mark the sudden passing of Darllie Pierre-Louis, a municipal councillor for the City of Mascouche.

An entire community is mourning the loss of this kind-hearted woman who went through life with a smile on her face and an infectious joie de vivre. Darllie was committed to humanitarian causes and got involved in their work to help improve people's lives.

I got to know her when she was my student. She always remained the same—an intense person, a good listener and a natural, positive leader. She was seen as a leader in workforce reintegration and the social economy in Lanaudière. She certainly distinguished herself as the executive director of Buffet Accès Emploi.

As deeply as she cared for her community, she cared for her family even more. I offer my deepest condolences to her husband, Carlho, and her three children.

I wish Darllie a safe journey. She will never be forgotten.

* * *

[English]

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's debt is out of control, and he set up the former finance minister to take the blame. Just last Tuesday, the fake feminist Prime Minister boasted about appointing Canada's first female finance minister. On Friday, he fired her, but first he expected her to deliver Mark Carney's fall economic statement. Why is that? It is because the old boys' club crashed through its guardrail of \$40 billion, ballooning the deficit to \$62 billion. This recklessness threatens our fiscal stability just as we face a possible trade war. Even the now former finance minister warned, "We need to take that threat extremely seriously. That means keeping our fiscal powder dry today, so we have the reserves we may need for a coming tariff war." Instead, Canadians are now paying \$53.7 billion to service the debt. After nine years of the Prime Minister's economic vandalism, Canadians are the ones who always have to pay the price.

* * *

• (1420)

HOLIDAY GREETINGS

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I love this time of year. As a child, I have fond memories of tobogganing in my local park in downtown Toronto, eagerly counting down the days to Christmas. It is a magical time of year, with carolling, gift-giving and gatherings where we share food and drink with those we love. It is also time to reflect and be thankful.

I want to thank all the organizations that are on the front lines and work so hard to support our communities right across our country. I want to thank the residents of my constituency of Davenport, my team and family for their ongoing love and support. I am thankful most of all for this amazing country we are all blessed to call our home. I am thankful for our freedom, our care for each other and our hopes and dreams for our future.

I wish all my colleagues and all those in the House a merry Christmas, happy Hanukkah and happy Kwanza. I wish for peace and prosperity for all in the year to come.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what a mess. Yesterday was a gong show at the bottom of a dumpster fire, wrapped up in a cluster. The former finance minister resigned and the Prime Minister hid all day, and then he had to beg his MPs not to fire him, but the worst news, buried underneath

it all, was a devastating gut punch to Canadian taxpayers: a \$62-billion deficit smashing through the already insane \$40-billion guardrail.

Canada is a serious G7 NATO partner, staring down the threat of 25% tariffs. We deserve a strong leader with a new mandate. Why not let Canadians decide by calling a carbon tax election?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the opposition House Leader for his heartfelt congratulations on my new role. I want to tell him and all Canadians that our government is very proud of the fall economic statement we made public yesterday. The fall economic statement speaks to growth in the Canadian economy. It speaks to supporting Canadians with serious affordability challenges. It speaks to a declining debt-to-GDP ratio, the best in the G7, and we have not finished supporting Canadians, something the Conservatives are not interested in doing.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the new finance minister for being the fourth finance minister in a 24-hour period, but it is the same old talking points. What the Liberals did yesterday was smash through that \$40-billion guardrail. What does that mean? It means Canadians have to pay back all that money with interest, and 43¢ of every dollar they earn now has to go to pay the tax burden. It means more money to bankers and bondholders. In fact, the government is now spending more on the interest on that debt than on health care, but the Prime Minister does not care. He does not worry about where the money comes from. He has never had to worry about that.

Why not let Canadians decide their future by calling a carbon tax election?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians expect their government to be focused on their economic concerns. They expect their government to be focused on the real threat that 25% tariffs across the board would mean to the Canadian economy. That is the work our government is doing. I can report that I had an encouraging preliminary conversation with the foreign affairs minister yesterday, with the U.S. border czar, Mr. Homan. We look forward to working with the incoming administration on border security, something the fall economic statement generously supported yesterday. This is the work Canadians expect us to be focused on and we are looking forward to doing that work.

Oral Questions

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are so proud of that fall budget that they tabled it in the House and then ran and hid for the rest of the day. Let us recap. The Prime Minister announced \$250 cheques and then had to cancel them. He announced a two-month GST tax trick that businesses say they will not implement and that the Prime Minister now says is optional. We have a broken immigration system. Parliament is seized with a \$400-million corruption scandal. All the while, there are 2 million food bank visits, doubled housing costs and record-high consumer debt. The dollar is below 70¢ U.S., and the Prime Minister is raising prices by quadrupling the carbon tax.

Again, why not let Canadians decide their future by calling a carbon tax election?

• (1425)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, we are proud of the fiscal and economic record of this government. This is a record of supporting Canadians through the pandemic. This is a record of investing in entrepreneurship and innovation. This is a record of providing, for example, Canadians with \$10-a-day child care, historic investments that speak to not only affordability issues, but growing the economy in a sustainable way. This is work we are proud to continue to do for Canadians, and we find it unfortunate that the opposition is trying to grind the House of Commons into chaos.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his minister, his MPs and Canadians, but he keeps hanging on to power.

Together with his key economic adviser, Mark Carney, he forced the former finance minister to exceed her already out-of-control fiscal anchor of \$40 billion by posting a massive \$62-billion deficit. This Prime Minister has added more national debt than all other prime ministers combined. This excessive spending is contributing to inflation.

When will he call an election?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fall economic statement was indeed tabled in the House of Commons yesterday. It is an economic statement that focuses on economic growth and the need to support Canadians during hard times, given the cost of living. That remains our government's primary objective, as it should.

This statement also shows that we are using taxpayers' money responsibly. That is exactly what we will keep doing, while keeping an eye on the support that Canadians need from their national government.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, how can we believe the new Minister of Finance when just yesterday, during an interview, he could not even put a number to the country's current debt? We have a long way to go.

The former minister of finance saw things clearly. What she said in her letter yesterday was very important:

That means keeping our fiscal powder dry today, so we have the reserves we may need for a coming tariff war. That means eschewing costly political gimmicks, which we can ill afford and which make Canadians doubt that we recognize the gravity of the moment.

That was the former finance minister's message to the Prime Minister. He never listens. He listens to no one. Let the government call an election now.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague is talking about the government's deficit. He knows full well that the net debt-to-GDP ratio is dropping. He knows that this is the best performance in the G7.

He also knows that Canadians expect their government to support them in tough economic times, whether it be with \$10-a-day child care or a dental care program. The Conservatives actually voted against all of those programs.

This is an important time for us to support Canadians, and we will continue to do so responsibly, as always.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the new Minister of Finance, but we cannot overlook the fact that there have been a series of crises that have been plaguing this government for a long time. Now, we have a bad economic update and a ridiculous deficit. There is also the \$5 billion that the government never should have given away and that, by its own admission, will be impossible to recoup. In short, we are going from crisis to crisis at a time when we should be preparing to negotiate with the United States in the context of a major diplomatic and political crisis.

How can this government still consider itself to be legitimate?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader of the Bloc Québécois for his congratulations.

A government is legitimate when it has the confidence of the House of Commons. That is exactly what the House gave the government several times last week. As the leader of the Bloc Québécois mentioned, our objective remains to support Canadians in tough economic times and to work with the administration of President-elect Trump, who will be inaugurated in January, to minimize or eliminate the tariff threat.

We will strengthen our borders and ensure we have the means to protect our economy.

Oral Questions

• (1430)

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government does not enjoy the confidence of the House, it enjoys the weakness of the NDP.

That being said, if the government claims to have the legitimacy to negotiate on the country's behalf through a potentially serious crisis, why would it not seek a mandate from the people, either now or in January, with this leader or another one? Then, we will see if it gets a new mandate, and if not, it will mean we have to say good-bye.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, Canadians expect the federal government, in partnership with provincial governments of course, to be hard at work protecting the economy from the threat of tariffs.

This is precisely the work we have been doing since the dinner we had in Florida with President-elect Trump. I can inform our colleagues that I have had quite encouraging exchanges with the incoming commerce secretary, Mr. Lutnick. As I said yesterday, we spoke to Mr. Homan, who is the border czar. I am encouraged by their openness and it is a job we are going to continue doing.

* * *

*[English]***LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA**

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people are right to be angry. We have a Prime Minister who is more interested in protecting his own job than he is in protecting Canadians against a threat—

The Speaker: I will ask the hon. members, in particular the hon. member for Miramichi—Grand Lake and the member for Dufferin—Caledon, please, to not raise their voices.

I will invite the hon. member for Burnaby South to start his question again.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, people are right to be angry. They have a Prime Minister who is more interested in protecting his own job than defending Canadians against Trump. We have a Prime Minister who has failed to defend workers from the rich CEOs the Conservatives love and who continue to rip off Canadians and drive up the cost of food and homes. The Prime Minister has failed. For New Democrats, it is always workers first and not CEOs, the CEOs the Conservatives want to defend.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge he has failed? He has to quit.

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House voted in confidence of this government just last week on multiple occasions. We have important work to do on behalf of Canadians. We have a very important relationship to manage with the United States at a pivotal time, and that is exactly what the government is focused on doing.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is more focused on protecting CEOs, to the harm of workers.

[Translation]

The Prime Minister is more interested in protecting his own job than he is in protecting Canadians against the threat of Donald Trump. The Prime Minister has failed to defend workers from the CEOs who are ripping them off. For the NDP, it is always workers first, not CEOs.

The Prime Minister has failed. Will he quit?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NDP leader knows full well that we won the confidence of the House last week on multiple occasions. This government's objective is always to protect Canadians, Canadian jobs and the Canadian economy. That is what we are focusing on right now, and I can assure the House that we are managing our relationship with the United States effectively.

* * *

*[English]***FINANCE**

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the fall economic statement confirmed what the former finance minister, the Parliamentary Budget Officer and The Globe and Mail already told us, that the weak and now wounded Prime Minister hijacked the statement to drive Canada through the fiscal guardrail and over a cliff. There is \$62 billion in overspending. This is 50% higher than their own target set just months ago. They told us over and over again that the deficit would not exceed \$40 billion.

I have a simple question: Why did they mislead Canadians again?

• (1435)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, far from misleading Canadians, the government thinks it is important to be transparent in terms of the fiscal picture of the government. This is why, based on legal advice and accounting practices, the government booked contingent liabilities that increased the initial deficit projection to the level my colleague referred to. This is about righting historical wrongs with indigenous peoples, something the previous Conservative government ignored. We think the responsible thing to do is to be transparent with Canadians. That is exactly what we did.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of the Liberal ministers who still remain, not a single one would stick around yesterday to even defend the statement. They dropped it here and then ran out the door. This is \$62 billion of new debt and new inflationary spending for Canadians to pay on their grocery bills, on their home heating and on everything else. This is equivalent to spending a dollar every second for nearly 2,000 years. The Prime Minister has clearly lost control of his caucus. He has lost control of his cabinet. He has now lost control of spending.

Oral Questions

When will he give Canadians the chance to weigh in and call a carbon tax election?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have no lessons to learn from the Conservatives. On the eve of Christmas, what we present to Canadians is not slogans or smiles. It is time for us to be serious. What the former minister of finance presented yesterday was a fall economic statement focused on growth, investment in our workers, investment in our industries and investment in Canada because confident countries invest in themselves. This is something the Conservatives cannot understand. We will stand for Canadians and we will stand for Canada on this side of the House.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, who is in charge of the clattering train? The Prime Minister has lost the confidence of Canadians, and now he has lost the confidence of his MPs and his cabinet. He is focused not on Canadians, but on himself as he clings to power. Yesterday, the government posted a \$62 billion deficit, blowing through the guardrails. The government is careening out of control. Things are in complete chaos.

When will we get an election?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Conservative opposition is doing is focusing on us while we are focusing on Canadians. We are focused on ensuring that we are delivering affordability measures for Canadians at a difficult time. We are focused on ensuring that we have a strong relationship with our most important trading partner, the United States. That is what the Liberal government is squarely focused on: Canadians, protecting the Canadian economy and protecting Canadian jobs.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, not only did the statement post a \$62 billion deficit, but also, it revised 2025 growth down, and it revised 2025 unemployment up. The Prime Minister has failed to recognize the gravity of the moment. He is focused not on Canadians, but on himself. His government is in utter and complete chaos.

When will the Prime Minister realize that the end is here, that his government and this Parliament are dead, and call an election?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we have the lowest debt and deficit in the G7. In addition, in the fall economic statement, Canadians can see supports for affordable housing, supports for \$10-a-day child care and supports for public servants who want early retirement. On this side of the house, what do we do? We support Canadians, as opposed to what they do, which is cut.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we would of course like to congratulate the new Minister of Finance, but we would also like to point out that, just nine years ago, in 2015, he, the Prime Minister and pretty much everyone on that side of the House were elected on a promise to run three small deficits followed by a zero deficit in 2019.

Nine years later, Canada has the worst deficit in our country's history, at \$62 billion. How can he look people in the eye and tell

them that, yes, the public finances are fine and that, yes, the Liberals are ready for an election?

Will he at least have the courage to ask his leader to call an election so that the people can decide whether the Liberals deserve Canadians' trust?

• (1440)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague for his congratulations. It will come as no surprise that we do not share his pessimism. We have every confidence in the Canadian economy, in Canadian workers and in the fall economic statement, which gave Canadians a great deal of hope in terms of support for these difficult economic times.

We have also announced significant investments. I look forward to sharing more details later today about the border measures that will further protect Canadians and reassure our American friends. We are working to support Canadians.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is basic finance. A deficit is money that we do not have. This \$62 billion is money that we do not have. This money represents the debt we are passing on to our children, our grandchildren and great-grandchildren who are not even born yet and who will have to pay for the current mismanagement.

Every Canadian knows that the Prime Minister is alone because Canada has never had such a narcissistic, egotistic, self-important Prime Minister. The problem is that all Canadians, even those who are not born yet, will have to pay for this mismanagement.

When will there be an election so that we can have a real government, a good Conservative government?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague will not be surprised that we do not agree with the idea of having a Conservative government that wants to cut programs that support Canadians, that voted against \$10 child care to support Canadian families, and that voted against a dental care program in Canada.

Canadians expect to have a responsible government that works to support them in economically tough times. That is precisely what our government is doing.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with a \$62-billion deficit, I think we can all agree that now is not the time to be handing out election goodies.

Oral Questions

However, in yesterday's economic statement, the GST holiday represented 98% of new spending aimed at combatting the rising cost of living. Worse still, this purely vote-seeking measure represents almost the entirety of the government's response to the cost of living until 2030. This two-month tax holiday, described by the former minister of finance as a costly political gimmick, is the Liberal government's idea of a long-term economic vision.

If that is the Liberals' long-term economic vision, perhaps they now understand why Quebeckers are calling for an election.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Bloc Québécois and the Conservatives have been talking non-stop about an election since September. We have been working for Quebeckers since 2015.

That is why, in recent months, we proposed a program like the Canadian dental care plan, which is helping one million Quebeckers and three million Canadians with their dental insurance, something the vast majority of them never had before. Unfortunately, the Conservatives and the Bloc stubbornly oppose this Canadian dental care plan. The Conservative leader claims that it does not even exist.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is simple: Quebeckers never wanted the GST holiday, which is harmful to our SMEs. Nevertheless, the GST holiday is the only measure in the economic update to address the cost of living, and it represents 98% of new spending.

The Liberals are running out of steam. They are short on ideas and short on resources with the resignation of the finance minister, which will be followed by the departure of eight other ministers from the Liberal ship. Quebeckers deserve so much better than a government that is crumbling before their eyes.

Will the Prime Minister finally call an election?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather clear that the Bloc Québécois is against tax cuts.

If my colleagues had read the economic update, they would have seen that we created over 330,000 well-paid jobs across Canada. Canada has seen the highest wage growth in the G7. Canadians are cashing paycheques that are 5% bigger, even taking into account inflation. We are making sure that Canadians' paycheques are getting bigger.

• (1445)

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there was a time when economic statements contained measures. This one contains nothing but bad news.

There is quite the contrast between the enthusiasm of 2015 and the cynical vote-buying deficits of 2024. There is a contrast between the solidarity of 2015 and the ministers who are jumping ship one after the other. There is quite the contrast between the superstar Prime Minister of 2015 and the one struggling tonight to rally his team for the Christmas party.

It is over. It is simply over. Will the Prime Minister call an election?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear my colleague talk that way. If he had made an effort to read the economic statement, he would know that it contains major investments for Quebec. Take the investment in AI, which will be at the heart of the 21st-century economy. Montreal has the largest concentration of start-ups in the country.

The economic statement includes investments for Quebec, investments for industry, investments for workers. Every member of the House is expected to celebrate this country. It is time to celebrate Canada.

[*English*]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): The Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his caucus, of his cabinet and of Canadians. The Deputy Prime Minister resigned because the Prime Minister said that he had lost confidence in her. She wrote, "a Minister must speak on behalf of the Prime Minister and with his full confidence. In making your decision, you made clear that I no longer credibly enjoy that confidence".

Just last week, the Prime Minister was talking about how Americans have lost the ability for females to lead in that country, but the Prime Minister only uses females when it is useful for him. Is that not right?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): No.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, of his caucus and of Canadians. He blew through the \$61.9-billion deficit, over the \$40-billion guardrails he had set. The former finance minister tried to warn him, and he fired her for trying to warn him. He offered her another position, and she refused.

Why is it that the Prime Minister only has confidence in women until they question him?

Hon. Marci Ien (Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Youth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives keep bandying about the word "feminism", but let us talk about tangible policies for women that are offered in the fall economic statement: \$50 million to build more shelter spaces across this country and \$15 million for women's organizations whose goal it is to end gender-based violence, as well as permanent funding for the sexual and reproductive health fund.

This is what it looks like to have the backs of women. Conservatives know nothing about that.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, of his Liberal MPs and of Canadians, as he clings to power.

Oral Questions

Hours before she was set to release the fall economic statement, the finance minister quit, saying, “On Friday, you told me you no longer want me to serve as your Finance Minister and offered me another position in the Cabinet.” The fake feminist Prime Minister and conflict of interest, carbon tax Carney forced her to blow through the \$40-billion guard rail with a massively irresponsible \$62-billion deficit, making her take the blame.

Will the fake feminist Prime Minister take responsibility for his economic vandalism and call an—

• (1450)

Hon. Marci Ien (Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Youth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Conservatives want to talk about feminism, then let us look at some facts and some policies that actually support women across this country, policies like \$10-a-day child care and policies like the national action plan to end gender-based violence, which was actually supported in our latest economic statement.

The Conservatives, by the way, opposed every single one of these measures. On this side of the House, we will always support women. Who knows what is going on over there?

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, his Liberal MPs and Canadians, as he clings to power.

The former finance minister said, “To be effective, a Minister must speak on behalf of the Prime Minister and with his full confidence. In making your decision, you made clear I no longer credibly enjoy that confidence and possess the authority that comes with it.” It is clear that the fake feminist Prime Minister threw the former finance minister under the bus, just as he did with other women who previously stood up to him.

Will the fake feminist Prime Minister take responsibility for his economic vandalism and call a carbon tax election?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Small Business, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are distracting from the fact that the Bank of Canada has cut interest rates five times, down to 3.25%.

Yesterday our government published the fall economic statement. I am happy to share that there is an investment of \$189 million into the Black entrepreneurship program that has already helped 16,000 Black entrepreneurs across this country.

We are going to be investing in digital adaption for small and medium-sized enterprises, with \$500 million. We are going to reduce red tape.

While we are shopping during the GST holiday, let us support local.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the caregivers pilot programs expired in June. The minister promised caregivers permanent residence on arrival. Six months later, no information, no application process, has been released about the new pilot.

Given the Liberals' about-face on regularization and their scapegoating of migrants for their failures, caregivers are really concerned that their hard-fought promise of landed status on arrival will be forgotten. Will the minister deliver on the promise and open the pathway for applications by January 1, 2025, or will this be another Liberal broken promise?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, caregivers are extremely important to this country, as is the care they provide to our most vulnerable. We are still tracking to launch this and clearly this is a priority of the government. This is on track. We may have some modifications to make, but this is still a high priority of the government.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' economic update failed to recognize the reality facing working Canadians. It failed to address the housing crisis. It failed to address the health care crisis. It failed to address the youth jobs crisis. Instead of fighting for Canadians, Liberals are fighting with themselves, and Conservatives only propose cuts that will hurt workers while big business gets tax breaks and handouts. Budgets reveal who governments are really working for.

Why are Liberals, like Conservatives, working for CEOs while ignoring everyone else?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that hon. member would know, because we worked very well together to create a national pharmacare plan that is going to make sure Canadians everywhere have access to the medication they need. It builds upon a Canadian advantage we need to maintain, an advantage that sees Canadians not only living longer but living six years more in health than they do in the United States. The lifespan we enjoy is every bit as important as every other measurement, and the advantage we have in health cannot be lost. We must continue to drive forward and transform our health system from one based in illness to one based in prevention.

*Oral Questions***REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Quebec announced a historic agreement on Churchill Falls, as well as an agreement to develop the Gull Island project and upgrade other hydroelectric assets. This deal has the potential to transform Newfoundland and Labrador and create tens of thousands of jobs and sweeping economic spinoffs.

Can the Minister of Rural Economic Development inform Canadians how our government helped create the economic conditions to make this deal possible?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after decades, Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec have signed a historic agreement that will have huge benefits for all. Our government is working toward a net-zero electricity grid and provided Newfoundlanders and Labradorians with assistance on rate mitigation. That along with the investment tax credits for net-zero projects helped create the conditions for this agreement to make Newfoundland and Labrador an economic and energy powerhouse. I congratulate both premiers on this historic deal and I cannot wait to see the shovels in the ground.

* * *

• (1455)

FINANCE

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost confidence of his cabinet, his caucus and all Canadians as he desperately clings to power. Yesterday the Liberals dropped their fall economic statement and literally ran out of the House: a \$62-billion deficit, missing their target by a whopping 55%. What is the end result? Canadians are now paying more on debt interest charges than on health care.

When will the Prime Minister end the misery and call a carbon tax election so Conservatives can finally fix what they have broken?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to inform the justice critic that in fact in that fall economic statement, he would have seen a series of measures that address community safety in our communities across the country. He would have seen measures that crack down on auto theft. He would have seen stricter bail and sentencing provisions. He would have seen provisions in the sex offender registries to get tough on child sex predators. He would have seen securing our borders to provide confidence to our American counterparts, cracking down on money laundering and terrorist financing. These are all measures we all have an interest in promoting, passing and getting funded in this country to keep Canadians safe.

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Prime Minister's economic vandalism and inflationary spending, he has added more to the debt than all previous prime ministers combined. Now Canadians are paying more. Our national debt now sits at \$1.24 trillion, an astronomical number our future generations will have to deal with. Canada's promise of pow-

erful paycheques, affordable housing and safe streets has been shattered under the NDP-Liberals.

The Prime Minister has lost confidence of his caucus, the House and Canadians. When will he call an immediate carbon tax election?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member is a former Crown attorney. He knows that in terms of keeping communities safe, it starts with addressing the prolific amount of guns that are in communities. What is in that fall economic statement? There is \$597 million to take weapons off our streets. What else is in there? That member knows organized criminality is a problem in Canada from coast to coast to coast. What we are doing with organized criminality is ensuring tougher penalties for financial crimes, cracking down on money laundering and cracking down on terrorist financing. One gets at the cause of the problem when one addresses the money flow. That is what we are doing in the fall economic statement. We wish we could have their support.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his ministers, his MPs and Canadians, yet he still clings to power.

After nine years of economic vandalism and inflationary spending, he has built up more debt than all his predecessors combined. As a result, Canadians are now paying \$53.7 billion in interest charges on the debt. That is more money than the health transfers.

Will the Prime Minister set his ego aside, do what is best for Canadians and call an election?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would invite my colleague to read the fall economic statement. If he does, he will see that Canada is in a particularly enviable fiscal position compared to all our G7 competitors. We have the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. The IMF, the International Monetary Fund, estimates that we will have the strongest economic growth next year. The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources just signed an agreement with the Government of Quebec for hundreds of millions of dollars to help the forestry sector in my colleague's region, yet my colleague is not talking about that.

When Canadians need help, the Conservatives are nowhere to be found.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his ministers, his MPs and Canadians.

Oral Questions

As if the \$40-billion anchor were not enough, he hits us with a \$62-billion debt in his economic statement. Canadians are paying more in interest on the debt than for health transfers. He is desperately hanging onto power. Enough is enough.

When will there be an election?

• (1500)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have more good news for Quebeckers today, with the publication of the clean electricity strategy. Hundreds of millions of dollars will be invested in collaboration with Hydro-Québec, with the Government of Quebec and with businesses to develop the electricity network we need for the 21st century to decarbonize our transportation sector and to decarbonize the industry and buildings sector.

That is how we are going to build the economy, jobs and the Canada of the 21st century.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we need no more than 30 seconds to review the Liberals' track record. The only thing the Prime Minister did this fall was buy some time.

He bought some time by letting the Conservatives paralyze House business, without ever trying to negotiate a way out of the stalemate. He bought some time with his election goodies. Today, he is still trying to buy himself time after his finance minister's resignation. Against all odds, he is stalling for time.

Does he not realize that by doing nothing but stall for time, he has lost the respect of Quebeckers?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague well knows, we have won the confidence of the House several times in recent weeks.

She may not have read all the appendices and items in the economic statement we presented yesterday, but there is one aspect that should really interest her. We included support for culture and support for tourism in the economic statement in order to bring more conventions and conferences here.

Honestly, everyone should be proud of the investment our government is making in culture.

Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this session has been one session too many.

The Liberals have been in the spotlight, but not because of their work. They refused to work for seniors and farmers. They refused to work to do away with the religious exemption. They refused to work to guarantee Quebeckers access to advance requests for medical assistance in dying. Unfortunately, all the attention has been on in-fighting in the Liberal caucus. That is why this question is on everyone's lips today.

When will we be free of this government that no longer wants to work for Quebeckers?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like make one thing clear. On this side of the House, we are working for Quebeckers and we are negotiating with the Government of Quebec to ensure that all of the investments that we are making are good for Quebeckers.

Here are a few examples: the dental care program and the Canada child benefit. In the economic update, there are measures to enhance the rent supplement. In fact, the government pays the rent supplement for low-income housing. There is also AI, housing and more. Our government worked with the Government of Quebec to resolve the situation with Chic Resto Pop.

* * *

[English]

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week, the Liberal Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, his Liberal MPs and Canadians, but he still clings to power. Yesterday, the economic statement from his phantom finance minister, carbon tax Carney, posted a \$62-billion deficit, which is absolutely devastating for Canadians. They tried to pin it on the former finance minister and she quit in protest. Canadians have had enough of these dirty Liberal backroom deals where carbon tax Carney gets all of the power but has none of the accountability.

When will the Liberals call a carbon tax election, because Canadians just cannot trust them?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, rather than talking down Canada, let us stress the facts. Inflation has come down to 1.9%. We have the lowest debt and the lowest deficit in the G7. In the fall economic statement, we put forward numerous measures to support businesses and families in Canada, including \$10-a-day child care, which is going to give rise to 300,000 jobs.

On this side of the House, we believe in supporting Canadians while maintaining a prudent fiscal outlook, something the Conservatives could never claim to do.

[Translation]

Long live Canada.

• (1505)

[English]

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just like the nine years of failures from the NDP-Liberal government, Canadians have lost confidence in the Prime Minister, and they showed it last night with the overwhelming majority election of Tamara Jansen in Cloverdale—Langley City. The phantom finance minister posted a \$62-billion devastating deficit that Canadians are going to be paying for, for generations. The Liberals have absolutely lost control and the flailing Prime Minister does not have the confidence of his cabinet, his caucus or Canadians.

When is he going to call a carbon tax election?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the fall economic statement yesterday—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. For male members, there are particular rules in terms of dress in this place. I am not certain that the sweater is a prop, but I will invite the hon. minister to button up his jacket.

The hon. minister.

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson: Today, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Canadian forest service, which is something I think all parliamentarians should be able to support.

In the fall economic statement, there were investment tax credits related to electricity production. This is part of building an economy for the future that will create jobs and economic prosperity across this country. It will ensure affordability for consumers. It will ensure the reliability of the grid. Today, I am very pleased to say we are launching Canada's first clean electricity strategy across the country and the clean electricity regulations.

It is an important day for Canada.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, his Liberal MPs and Canadians as he is desperately clinging to power. He forced the former finance minister to join the ghosts of ministers past in favour of phantom finance minister carbon tax Carney because they thought that her massive deficit was not big enough. With all the chaos he has caused around him, the Prime Minister's own inner circle is abandoning him.

He went to the Governor General yesterday to appoint Carney's placeholder, but why did he not go one step further and just call a carbon tax election?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, another element of the fall economic statement yesterday was the launch of the indigenous loan guarantee program, which will make indigenous peoples partners in projects across this country. It is part of building an economy that is inclusive and prosperous on a go-forward basis.

On the other side of the House, we have a bunch of climate skeptics and climate deniers who have a plan for the economy that is

Oral Questions

based on the 1960s and looking backwards. On this side of the House, we are building a future for Canadians.

* * *

JUSTICE

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we live in an increasingly virtual world, and it is our job to ensure that this online space is safe for our children and for all Canadians. That is why our government introduced a plan to do exactly that in the online harms act. Unfortunately, the Conservatives are blocking this important legislation. Their obstruction means that children, women and minority groups remain in danger. I am appalled that the Conservatives will not put Canadians before partisan politics and work with us.

Can the Minister of Justice explain the consequences we face by not passing the online harms act?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1510)

The Speaker: For the second time today, I am going to ask the hon. member for Miramichi—Grand Lake and the hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon to please not take the floor unless the Speaker recognizes them.

The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week in this place, the Conservatives blocked the child protection measures in the online harms act from advancing. Worse still, the Conservatives have vowed that if we succeed in passing this legislation, with the help of the Bloc and the NDP, they will actually reverse it at the earliest opportunity. What does that mean? It means that if we get child sex abuse material off of the Internet, if the Conservatives took power, they would put it back on the Internet. I wish I could make this up. That position is morally bankrupt.

I would say that when we claim to care about victims of abuse, we need to stand up for victims of abuse. I would ask the Conservatives to please do that.

The Speaker: I would like to apologize to the hon. member for Miramichi—Grand Lake. Apparently, he was not the person who had spoken out.

The hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton.

* * *

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost all control. Not only has the Prime Minister long ago lost the moral authority to govern, but also the Prime Minister has lost his ability to carry out the basic functions of governing, with the shambolic spectacle of his former finance minister resigning hours before she was scheduled to deliver the government's fall economic statement. This is a government in complete and utter chaos.

Oral Questions

When will the Prime Minister admit that he has lost all control and call a carbon tax election?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this may be the last opportunity I have to answer a question in the House of Commons as a minister. I want to take an opportunity to give my thanks to everybody back home in my community and to all members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, for an opportunity to engage in debate over the years and to put competing ideas on the table.

When it comes to the way that caucuses should operate, I would remind my hon. colleague, as one of the people who has written to advocate for his community to receive funding through the housing accelerator fund, that he has now been banned by his own leader to continue to advocate on behalf of the good people of St. Albert—Edmonton.

It has been an honour to serve. I look forward to what the future may hold.

I want to say congratulations to a term well served by all colleagues.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of Canadians, lost the confidence of many of his MPs, and yesterday, he lost the confidence of the former finance minister. It is no wonder because, after nine years, the Prime Minister has broken everything. He has broken our borders, broken immigration, broken housing and broken the budget.

When will the Prime Minister just stop breaking things, acknowledge that he does not have a mandate to continue to govern and call a carbon tax election?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fall economic statement that we tabled yesterday is about growth. It is about investing in our business community and in our economy. The accelerated capital cost allowance will ensure that Canadian businesses stay on this side of the border, that they stay in Canada and that our creation of jobs will continue to increase. Last year alone, 330,000 jobs were created, and these are good-paying jobs. Even when accounting for inflation, salaries have risen by 5%, which is the highest in the G7. We are ensuring that Canadians bring home stronger paycheques and better jobs.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has lost the confidence of his cabinet, of his Liberal MPs and of Canadians, while desperately clinging to power. Yesterday, they found a random Liberal minister to table the disastrous fall economic statement after he fired his former finance minister, who would not sign off on smashing through her \$40-billion fiscal guardrail. That was all in order to make room for a phantom finance minister, Mark Carney.

The Prime Minister has lost control of his own government. Will he call a carbon tax election today?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House, they are big on outreach, but they are really weak on facts. When we talk about Canadians, we want to show

that we support them and invest in them. We have the lowest ratio of debt to GDP in the G7. Interest rates have gone down. We have been investing in Canadians. That is what we do as a government. We invest in child care, we invest in national school food programs and we invest in pharmacare, because we invest and fight for Canadians. The Conservatives would cut and they would talk Canadians down. On this side of the House, we are proud to fight for Canadians every single day.

* * *

● (1515)

JUSTICE

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, children in Canada need protection from online harm. The abuse that occurs online is endangering our kids, and it is time we acted to prevent more families from being harmed. Our government has risen to this challenge, putting forward a plan to help parents and children. Bill C-63, the online harms act, would create safety measures that would save lives. The Conservatives are now the only roadblock to making the bill a reality in Canada.

The safety of our children should not be political. Can the Minister of Justice please discuss the importance of this critical legislation and why we need it passed now?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this legislation would literally save children's lives. I find it very difficult to comprehend how the official opposition Conservatives can bear being the only party in this House obstructing the advancement of this legislation. I would share a question that was posed at committee by a mother whose child suffered horrendous abuse. She asked what kind of person does not want to protect the future of our children or grandchildren.

Once again, I implore the official opposition to look beyond its self-interest and look these parents and their children in the eye who need help. It is time we passed the online harms act with unanimous consent.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a shortage of family doctors. It is an acute crisis that is getting more and more severe each and every day. The Liberals seem to be focused on their own internal problems while parents are looking to get care for their sick kids. The former deputy prime minister said as much yesterday when she resigned, and the Conservatives, sadly, just want to cut health care, cut health services and destroy public health care. Given the emergency, what is the Liberal government's plan to address this shortage and make sure we have more family doctors now in Canada?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have signed agreements with every province and every territory. We saw in the CIHI baseline data last year that nearly every jurisdiction in the country saw more doctors and more nurses. It is not enough. Provinces have to do their part and have to be responsible for this health transformation. However, there is something huge this Parliament can do, and that is pass Bill C-72, which is connected care legislation. Just one example is that allowing AI scribes to be used in our system would create the equivalent of 1,000 new doctors in a very short period of time. Connected care can open up new avenues of care, and that is something this Parliament can do.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thanks to this Prime Minister, our nation has become the laughingstock of the narcissist at Mar-a-Lago. Our country is facing an unprecedented level of political coercion, and Canadians deserve a strong and proud defence of our values and our jobs. We are not going to get that from the Liberal gong show or from the predatory and pusillanimous Conservatives who would sell us out in a second. Our NDP leader called for a war room, bringing together labour and business leaders to defend Canada.

Will the Liberals stop their squabbling? It is time to drop the gloves, go over the boards and fight for our country instead of fighting amongst themselves.

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we tabled the fall economic statement, and I think this is an area where the hon. member and I would agree. The Canada-U.S. relationship is extremely important, and in the fall economic statement, we are strengthening the regime to prohibit forced labour in our supply chains, something that is really important for workers in our country. We are strengthening this trade relationship with our allies in the United States.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Before the House wraps up for the year, the members of the Bloc Québécois want to wish a merry Christmas and a happy 2025 to all Quebecers, our colleagues and their staffers, all the House of Commons staff, the entire team of clerks, the law clerks, the analysts, the pages, the Parliamentary Protective Service, the warm and welcoming team in the parliamentary cafeteria and dining room, the maintenance team, the computer technicians, the Sergeant-at-Arms' team and, last, but certainly not least, the interpreters, with whom we have a very special relationship.

Happy holidays, Mr. Speaker.

● (1520)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his wishes. I also want to extend my best wishes to him and all members of the House of Commons.

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Williams: Mr. Speaker, knowing that our House time is coming to an end and that we want to make sure that we look at

this \$1.2-trillion trade relationship with the Americans, we have a unanimous consent motion.

I move that, notwithstanding any standing orders, special orders—

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just so that I am clear, it was the Liberal members who said they did not want to have emergency hearings on the \$1.2 trillion—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We cannot do indirectly what we cannot do directly.

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

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party of Canada, I want to take a moment, as the season is upon us and as we are ending 2024, to sincerely wish all of those who help us do our work a very happy holiday season. The people who keep this place running are so integral to all of the work that all of us do. Every single one of them makes sure that MPs can serve their constituents day in and day out.

I thank everyone at the table very much for their dedicated service. I thank the amazing pages, who help us in this place every single day, and the security personnel, who work so hard ensuring the security of MPs and staff. I thank our Sergeant-at-Arms very much. I thank the food service and cafeteria staff, who keep us fed and supplied with coffee all day long. We all know that we need that coffee, some days more than others. I thank the maintenance and client service personnel, who keep our offices clean and running, and our IT staff, who answer call after call, ensuring that our phones, apps and computers are running. Of course, I think we can all agree that our amazing interpreters deserve our very heartfelt thanks.

On behalf of me and all New Democrats, I want to thank everyone and hope they have a wonderful holiday season. I am sure they are very grateful that we are having a break.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member. Once again, on behalf of the entire House administration and all its employees, we thank all members for their kind wishes.

The hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn is also rising.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, you shall find unanimous consent that notwithstanding any standing—

Oral Questions

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Lori Idlout: [*Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[*English*]

Uqaqtittiji, first of all, I would like to wish happy holidays to my constituents in Nunavut as well as all of Canada.

In the generous spirit of the season, I hope that, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion that—

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following bill: Bill C-79, an act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025.

● (1525)

I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-15, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Wild Animal and Plant Protection and Regulation of International and Interprovincial Trade Act.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is such an honour to rise in this place on behalf of the constituents of Burlington. I would like to say to all of my colleagues, despite the fact that this was a rather unusual session of Parliament, it is a pleasure to be able to work with everyone on all sides of the House, mostly. I know everybody is ready to go into the holidays.

On behalf of the Liberal members of Parliament, I would like to extend my gratitude to everybody who works in the House of Commons, who serves us so well, stays here on late nights and makes sure we are so well supported. To them and their families, I wish a very happy holidays as well. I would like to wish folks in Burlington and right across the country a very merry Christmas and a very happy Hanukkah to all who are celebrating. I look forward to 2025 and all that the new year has to offer. I want to wish all of my colleagues all of the best for the year ahead.

With that, pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28, 2024, I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion.

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.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Liberals are running scared. We ask for a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (1540)

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, the opposition would love the ability to vote twice, especially on matters of confidence. I want to point out to the Chair that the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill was not in her seat but was counted on the standing vote and also voted on the app. I am seeking clarity from the Chair on that and on whether in fact her vote would count.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is correct. Of course I would not vote twice, but when I went—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak. I am trying to address the concern that was raised.

I was not in my seat for the beginning of the vote, and the opposition was calling out that my vote would not count. After I stood up, I realized I should not be doing that, so I used my app instead, assuming that because the opposition would protest and say I could not vote, then I would still have a vote. I did vote.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill. The table recorded her participation only once.

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

(*Division No. 928*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Badawey
Baker	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos

Oral Questions

Fraser	Freeland	Brassard	Brock
Fry	Gaheer	Cannings	Caputo
Gainey	Garon	Carrie	Chambers
Gaudreau	Gerretsen	Chong	Collins (Victoria)
Gill	Gould	Cooper	Dalton
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Dance	Davidson
Hanley	Hardie	Davies	Deltell
Hepfner	Holland	d'Entremont	Desjarlais
Housefather	Hussen	Doherty	Dowdall
Hutchings	Iacono	Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ien	Jaczek	Ellis	Epp
Joly	Jones	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Jowhari	Kayabaga	Fast	Ferreri
Kelloway	Khalid	Gallant	Garrison
Khera	Koutrakis	Gazan	Généreux
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde	Genius	Gladu
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Godin	Goodridge
Lapointe	Larouche	Gourde	Gray
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Green	Hallan
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Hoback	Hughes
Lemire	Lightbound	Idlout	Jeneroux
Long	Longfield	Jivani	Johns
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Julian	Kelly
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Khanna	Kitchen
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Kmiec	Kram
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
McGuinty	McKay	Kusie	Kwan
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Lake	Lantsman
Mendès	Miao	Lawrence	Lehoux
Miller	Morrissey	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Murray	Naqvi	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Ng	Noormohamed	Lloyd	Lobb
Normandin	O'Connell	MacGregor	Maguire
Oliphant	O'Regan	Majumdar	Masse
Pauzé	Perron	Mathysen	Mazier
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Qualtrough	Robillard	McPherson	Melillo
Rogers	Romanado	Moore	Morantz
Rota	Sahota	Morrice	Morrison
Sajjan	Saks	Motz	Muys
Sarai	Sauvé	Nater	Patzer
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Schiefke	Serré	Redekopp	Reid
Sgro	Shanahan	Rempel Garner	Richards
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Roberts	Rood
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Ruff	Scheer
Sinclair-Desgagné	Sorbara	Schmale	Seeback
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Shields	Shipley
St-Onge	Sudds	Singh	Small
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Soroka	Steinley
Thériault	Therrien	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Thompson	Trudeau	Strahl	Stubbs
Trudel	Turnbull	Thomas	Tochor
Valdez	Van Bynen	Tolmie	Van Popta
van Koeverden	Vandal	Vecchio	Vidal
Vandenbeld	Vignola	Vien	Viersen
Villemure	Virani	Vis	Vuong
Weiler	Wilkinson	Wagantall	Warkentin
Yip	Zahid	Waugh	Webber
Zuberi— 177		Williams	Williamson
		Zarrillo	Zimmer— 140

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The House stands adjourned until Monday, January 27, 2025, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 28(4), when it will resume consideration of the privilege motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 94, I wish to inform hon. members that Private Members' Business will be suspended on that day.

Oral Questions

I wish all members happy holidays, merry Christmas, happy Hanukkah and any religious holiday they celebrate, and certainly a happy new year. I look forward to seeing everyone in the new year.

(The House adjourned at 3:47 p.m.)

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	29125

Holiday Greetings	
Ms. Dzerowicz	29125

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy	
Mr. Scheer	29125
Mr. LeBlanc	29125
Mr. Scheer	29125
Mr. LeBlanc	29125
Mr. Scheer	29126
Mr. LeBlanc	29126
Mr. Paul-Hus	29126
Mr. LeBlanc	29126
Mr. Paul-Hus	29126
Mr. LeBlanc	29126

International Trade	
Mr. Blanchet	29126
Mr. LeBlanc	29126
Mr. Blanchet	29127
Mr. LeBlanc	29127

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Singh	29127
Ms. Gould	29127
Mr. Singh	29127
Ms. Gould	29127

Finance	
Ms. Lantsman	29127
Mr. LeBlanc	29127
Ms. Lantsman	29127
Mr. Champagne	29128
Mr. Chong	29128
Ms. Gould	29128
Mr. Chong	29128
Ms. Anand	29128
Mr. Deltell	29128
Mr. LeBlanc	29128
Mr. Deltell	29128
Mr. LeBlanc	29128
Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné	29128
Mr. Duclos	29129
Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné	29129
Ms. Bendayan	29129
Mr. Perron	29129
Mr. Champagne	29129
Mrs. Kusie	29129
Ms. Gould	29129
Mrs. Kusie	29129
Ms. Ien	29129
Mrs. Gray	29129
Ms. Ien	29130
Mrs. Gray	29130
Mrs. Valdez	29130

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Kwan	29130
Mr. Miller	29130

Government Priorities	
Mr. Davies	29130
Mr. Holland	29130

Regional Economic Development	
Ms. Thompson	29131
Ms. Hutchings	29131

Finance	
Mr. Brock	29131
Mr. Virani	29131
Mr. Brock	29131
Mr. Virani	29131
Mr. Martel	29131
Mr. Guilbeault	29131
Mr. Martel	29131
Mr. Guilbeault	29132

Government Priorities	
Mrs. Desbiens	29132
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	29132
Mrs. Desbiens	29132
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	29132

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Barrett	29132
Ms. Anand	29132
Mr. Barrett	29133
Mr. Wilkinson	29133
Mr. Patzer	29133
Mr. Wilkinson	29133

Justice	
Ms. Taylor Roy	29133
Mr. Virani	29133

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Cooper	29133
Mr. Fraser	29134
Mr. Cooper	29134
Ms. Bendayan	29134
Mr. Kelly	29134
Ms. Saks	29134

Justice	
Mr. Sorbara	29134
Mr. Virani	29134

Health	
Mr. Julian	29134
Mr. Holland	29135

Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Angus	29135
Ms. Ng	29135

Message from the Senate	
The Speaker	29136

Business of the House

Ms. Gould 29136

Motion..... 29136

Motion agreed to 29137

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>