



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 066
Wednesday, December 3, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: The member for Cumberland—Colchester will be leading us today in the singing of the national anthem.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

THE MEN OF THE DEEPS

Mike Kelloway (Sydney—Glace Bay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour Jim MacLellan, best known as “Big Jim”, the last original performing member of the Men of the Deeps, who has officially retired after nearly 60 remarkable years with the choir. At 91 years of age, Jim gave his final performance this past weekend at the historic Savoy Theatre in Glace Bay during a Christmas show. He shared that emotions were running high before and after the show, and the crowd's response made the moment even more meaningful.

Jim was a founding member of the Men of the Deeps in 1966. Like so many Cape Bretoners of his generation, he came from the mines, starting at the age of 17 in the No. 12 colliery, before later moving into engineering. He brought that lived experience to the stage, telling stories, singing with the group and helping audiences connect to Cape Breton's proud mining heritage. His fellow members describe him as humble, hard-working and a true embodiment of what the choir represents.

On behalf of our community, I want to thank Big Jim for nearly six decades of dedication. I wish him nothing but the very best in his retirement.

* * *

GORDIE HOWE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 long years of Liberal mismanagement, Windsor is still waiting for the Gordie Howe bridge to open. A project that should have been a symbol of national strength is now becoming a monument to Liber-

al incompetence. The timelines keep shifting, the excuses keep changing and there is zero transparency.

Here is the part that worries me the most: When Windsor residents, local businesses or even their local MPs seek answers, the ministers responsible either pass the buck or do not answer the emails at all. Imagine that, a government that cannot deliver a bridge, cannot meet a deadline and cannot be bothered to reply.

Meanwhile, our manufacturers are forced to take detours. Truckers are stuck with using one privately owned crossing that is gouging them. Every delay bleeds money, jobs and confidence out of Canada's most important trade corridor. This is not just a failure to deliver; this is a failure to govern. The people of Windsor-Essex are tired of the “who cares?” attitude. They deserve better and I am here to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Don Valley North.

* * *

NORTH YORK GENERAL HOSPITAL SENIORS' HEALTH CENTRE

Maggie Chi (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the North York General Hospital's Seniors' Health Centre on its 40 years of exceptional and compassionate care. I advise the House of this wonderful institution, as it is the hub of medical services for seniors in my riding of Don Valley North. It first opened its doors in 1985 as a 60-bed long-term care home. It has stood the test of time and has grown to 192 beds.

I want to take this occasion to acknowledge the natural care, commitment and unwavering dedication of the staff at the health centre to patients and families. For 40 years, they have proved that the best care is timeless and that compassion never grows old. As we see, the Seniors' Health Centre has been aging gracefully, and if its first 40 years are any indication, the best is still yet to come.

Statements by Members

• (1405)

CHRISTMAS

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, amid the joy, light and wonder of the holiday season stands the story of Christmas, as powerful today as it was over 2,000 years ago. Jesus Christ, born as a lowly baby in a manger, fulfilled prophecies long foretold, bringing hope to a waiting world. His birth reminds us that God often works through what is unexpected, using humility and faithfulness to accomplish great purpose.

Through his life and humble obedience, Jesus extended to humanity the gift of salvation, enduring hope and transformative love. During this season of Christmas, and in all seasons, this miraculous gift fills hearts with peace, uplifts spirits with renewed faith and blesses all who receive it with a hope and a love that never wanes.

To the Speaker, my colleagues in the House and those all across our nation, I wish them all a very merry Christmas.

* * *

GRADUATION RATES

Chris Malette (Bay of Quinte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable progress being made by the Hastings and Prince Edward District School Board. It was recently announced by the board that it has increased its five-year graduation rate to 81.5%, a rise of more than five percentage points since 2021. This achievement reflects the dedication of our educators, support staff, families and, of course, the students themselves.

The board has now launched its 2025-30 multi-year strategic plan, a road map focused on ensuring that every student is well-skilled and prepared for a bright future. We must, as a country, continue to invest in our schools and our youth, from all levels of government. Continued progress depends on timely access to the supports on which students rely. This includes Jordan's principle funding remaining essential for indigenous learners across our region.

Today, I commend HPEDSB for its rising graduation rates and its commitment to excellence.

* * *

CHRISTMAS

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians, Christmas reminds us of the many blessings we enjoy. The greatest among them is the gift of Jesus Christ, when God became man to redeem humanity and bring light into a dark world.

During the Christmas season, we are reminded that the Bible was the foundation that shaped the roots of Canada. From the words of Psalm 72, "He shall have dominion...from sea to sea", that are inscribed on the stones of Parliament and enshrined as the motto of our nation to our values of freedom, hope and charity, we are reminded that the Christian faith has been woven into the fabric of our nation. This heritage has blessed us with our traditions, our values and our holidays. It has helped create a nation that prizes freedom, honours human dignity and seeks justice and compassion for all.

This Christmas, may we, in our hearts, accept Jesus, God's gift to us, and continue working to preserve the nation that God has entrusted to us, a nation glorious and free. To you, Mr. Speaker, to my constituents of Provencher and to all Canadians, I wish a merry Christmas.

* * *

UKRAINE

Karim Bardeesy (Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the resilience of Ukrainian nationals and Ukrainian Canadians in west Toronto and across Canada as Ukraine enters another winter defending itself from the illegal Russian invasion.

Organizations such as Ukrainian Canadian Social Services and the Toronto chapter of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress have added their voices to making the essential case for this Commons to authorize unprecedented investments in Ukrainian defence, security and aid, including yesterday's announcement of an additional \$200 million in military assistance. I am proud to be associated with a government that has invested more per capita in Ukraine's defence than any other nation.

I also want to salute the work of Ukrainian Canadian heroes such as Oleksandr Romanko of the UCC's technology and innovation committee, and Ann Szyptur from Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, the first vice-president of the Canadian Ukrainian Congress.

On Holodomor Memorial Day, we were fortunate to hear from Mykola Latyshko, who shared his first-hand experience of survival during a Russia-forced famine carried out nearly 100 years ago. Then, as today, we know that Ukraine will never bow to Russian aggression. *Slava Ukraini.*

* * *

• (1410)

ATHLETIC ACHIEVEMENT

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize one of Canada's brightest young athletes, Victoria Mboko. At just 19 years old, she has won major tennis tournaments, winning two WTA singles titles, including the Canadian Open. She achieved a singles ranking of number 18 in the world on November 3. Earlier, she posted a stretch of 22 straight match wins without dropping a set on the ITF circuit, and she represented Canada in the Billie Jean King Cup.

This is all with the support of Tennis Canada's elite training program. As a former professional tennis player and coach, I know that these wins have come at a tremendous amount of sacrifice, grit and determination.

Let us celebrate Vicky Mboko for all that she has achieved. She is a shining example and a hero to a generation of young Canadians. We are so proud of Vicky.

* * *

[Translation]

TREMBLANT WORLD CUP

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after last year's heartbreaking cancellation due to a lack of snow, the women's giant slalom world cup is finally back at Mont Tremblant this weekend. This is great news for everyone who loves alpine skiing.

Hosting a world cup event is more than an honour; it is a mark of international recognition. It shows that our know-how ranks among the best in the world when it comes to hosting an event of this scale.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Arianne Forget and Justine Lamontagne, two Quebec women who will be racing down the slopes. As the Bloc Québécois tourism critic and member for Laurentides—Labelle, I am proud to see Tremblant, the Laurentians and Quebec in the global spotlight. I commend the leadership of Patrice Malo and his entire team, who make Mont-Tremblant an outstanding resort.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week in Surrey, federal, provincial and local leaders, along with law enforcement agencies, came together for an anti-extortion summit to address the growing threat extortion crimes bring to our communities. Extortion, often tied to organized crime, puts families and small businesses at risk.

Our government, led by our Prime Minister, is taking strong and coordinated action. We are strengthening enforcement through the B.C. extortion task force and creating a new regional integrated drug enforcement team. We are also expanding support for victim services and investing in prevention through a new youth engagement hub in Surrey.

We are taking real steps to keep our communities safe and to stop organized crime from harming families across the Lower Mainland.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand today with my fellow Vancouver Island colleagues. I am heartbroken. Yesterday the Crofton pulp mill in my riding announced a full mill closure, with 375 direct and 1,000 indirect jobs, and almost a billion dollars' worth of economic impact in the region, lost.

However, this is not about numbers; this is about the workers and their families. They simply want jobs, safe communities and an affordable life. Many of them are from Duncan and from North Cowichan, which is already struggling with homelessness, unem-

Statements by Members

ployment and one of the highest crime rates in British Columbia. Life will now get worse for even more families.

The Prime Minister should be ashamed. His promises, policies and platitudes have all failed, while he says, "Who cares?" He has failed to negotiate a trade deal, leaving B.C. with 31 mills closed, and counting, and 45% tariffs on softwood lumber that are destroying the entire industry.

I will always stand for the responsible use of natural resources and our economic well-being. Will the Prime Minister do so?

* * *

● (1415)

ECUMENICAL COUNCIL ANNIVERSARY

Annie Koutrakis (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a very positive moment of spiritual and diplomatic significance that took place last week in the ancient city of Nicaea in the Republic of Turkey.

Pope Leo and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew marked 1700 years since the first ecumenical council, held in 325. That council helped shape Christianity and our basic values and beliefs, including respect, harmony, solidarity and freedom, which are also embedded in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[Translation]

The leaders of the Catholic and Orthodox churches commemorated this historic anniversary by sending a powerful message to the world about the need for reconciliation, dialogue and mutual respect for all people, regardless of their beliefs or ethnic origin.

In an era marked by conflict, persecution and polarization, their meeting shows that it is possible to overcome our differences in the service of peace and human dignity.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people in our regions are fed up with seeing one set of rules for ordinary people and another set of rules for the Prime Minister's buddies.

While families are cutting back on groceries and 2.2 million people are visiting food banks, the Liberal government found a way to help Brookfield, the Prime Minister's former company. This giant company hid profits in tax havens and dodged \$6.5 billion in taxes. These taxes could have supported our workers and our communities.

Oral Questions

While unemployment is rising to 6.9%, the Liberals are signing a \$500-million contract to create jobs in Europe, at a campus where Brookfield owns half the assets. Back home, we call that a free ride for their pals.

A government exists to serve the people, not its buddies. In my riding, in the Lower St. Lawrence and in Chaudière-Appalaches, people play by the rules. They deserve a government that does the same.

* * *

VICTORIA MBOKO

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are delighted to welcome to Ottawa a young athlete who is raising Canada's profile around the world: Victoria Mboko.

At just 19 years of age, Victoria has established herself as one of the rising stars of world tennis. By winning her first WTA 1000-level title right here in Canada at the National Bank Open in Montreal, Victoria has demonstrated surprising talent, remarkable determination and a maturity worthy of the greatest champions.

I had the privilege of attending the semifinals and finals in Montreal, after which I presented her with a member of Parliament certificate of recognition. Her journey is a testament to the power of hard work, discipline and resilience, and she is already inspiring thousands of young people across the country.

On behalf of my colleagues in the House, I thank Victoria for making Canada proud. I congratulate her and wish her continued success in inspiring an entire generation.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians voted for a home they can afford, a place to raise their kids and a place to sleep at night without lying awake doing the math. However, after all the Liberal glossy promises, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has made one thing painfully clear: The government's housing plan is built on wishful thinking, not on real results.

The Liberals' boast has been “We are here for the low-income families”, but the PBO report says that by 2028 the government will be spending less than half of what it does today on programs that help them keep a roof over their head. What we also learned is that the Liberals' big program delivers only 26,000 homes over five years, nowhere close to the 1.25 million homes they promised Canadians.

Get this: The so-called affordable rents under the plan are over \$2,100. What else should we expect, I guess, when the Prime Minister comes from a world where affordability means removing the tax from yachts and private jets? However, the single mom working two jobs hears that number and feels her stomach drop because, at that price, she is only one paycheck away from homelessness.

• (1420)

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Leslie Church (Toronto—St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. Reflecting on this year's United Nations' theme, “fostering disability inclusive societies for advancing social progress”, we are reminded that inclusion is not just an aspiration; it is a responsibility.

This year our government launched the Canada disability benefit, a vital new addition to our social safety net that is already helping over 232,000 Canadians. Budget 2025 ensures that the benefit is tax-free, and it also proposes a \$150 payment to help cover the cost of applying for the disability tax credit.

Today let us celebrate progress and pledge to continue the work needed to remove barriers: to make employment meaningful, available and accessible, built to welcome people of all abilities; and to make inclusion feel like belonging, not an accommodation but a right. With determination and partnership, nothing about us without us, we can build Canada, and all of our communities, strong.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Heritage is fed up, but so are Canadians. They are fed up with paying \$16,800 a year for groceries. They are fed up with paying 51% more for groceries. They are fed up with paying 30% more for a rib-eye steak. They are fed up with paying 23% more for a whole chicken.

How many people will be forced to go to the food bank before the Prime Minister gets fed up too?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I am pleased to say that according to the consumer price index, Canada's inflation rate has gone down to 2.2%. Second, I am pleased to say that wages have been growing at a rate of 3.2%.

We are making progress. The unemployment rate is down, the economy is growing and life is good.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there, he said it, he is happy with the cost of groceries.

According to “Canada's Food Price Report”, when the Liberal government came to power, it cost an average family \$8,300 a year for groceries. Now it costs \$16,800. It has doubled because of taxes and inflationary deficits that are driving up the cost of everything. The Prime Minister promised to be judged on grocery prices.

According to that report, which comes out tomorrow, how much will it cost to eat in 2026?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand why the Leader of the Opposition forgets to mention that this is a new Canadian government. We have the strongest economy in the G7. That is the truth. Those are the numbers, and that is the future of this great country.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to “Canada’s Food Price Report”, when the Liberals took office the cost of a basket of groceries was \$8,300. Now it is \$16,800, which is double. Liberal inflationary deficits, and taxes on farm equipment, fertilizer and food processors, have all exploded the cost of food. Tomorrow that same report will be released, projecting the cost for next year.

Given the Prime Minister’s promise to be judged by the prices at the grocery store, how much will Canadians have to spend on groceries to survive next year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us get our numbers straight. The Canadian economy is the strongest-growing economy in the G7, at 2.6% annualized. Canadian wages have been growing faster than inflation for every month the current government has been in office, at 3.2% over 2.2%.

Unemployment is down. Wages are up. The land is strong. We are moving forward.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians walk down the grocery aisle watching the prices rise before their eyes, they should know that the Prime Minister, who stashes his cash in a tax haven, says that they have never had it so good, the Canadian people, who have seen their grocery bills literally double under the Liberal government, from \$8,300 to \$16,800, in a decade. Tomorrow we will find out in the “Canada Food Price Report” how much groceries will cost an average family next year.

Given that the Prime Minister has promised to be judged on the price of groceries, will he tell Canadian families how much they will have to pay to survive?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the government is happy to tell Canadian families is that we cut the taxes for 22 million Canadians, we cut the taxes on first-time homebuyers and we are investing a budget, which the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite voted against, that is going to cause \$1 trillion of investment in this country over the next five years, grow jobs and grow futures for Canada.

We believe in Canada. Come join us.

STEEL AND ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we voted against the Prime Minister’s doubling Justin Trudeau’s deficit, which will drive up groceries even more.

What is he spending the money on? It is on corporate bailouts for companies that ship jobs out of Canada. The Prime Minister promised he would negotiate a win and have a deal by July 21.

However, with still no win, still no deal and still no elbows, 1,000 workers at Algoma Steel are now losing their jobs.

We now learn that the Prime Minister gave \$400 million to the corporate executives of that company without any job guarantees. How is it that the Prime Minister could have been so incompetent as to saddle Canadians who cannot afford to pay their bills with a \$400-million bailout bill, without any guarantee of jobs staying in Canada?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these are difficult times in Sault Ste. Marie, and our hearts go to the families.

However, as the CEO of Algoma Steel said, it would be “an even darker day” if this government had not acted. That loan, that support, saved two-thirds of those jobs. That loan, that support, gives Algoma a bridge to the future that we are building strong in this country and that the Conservatives voted against.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, as long as the CEO is happy with the \$400-million gift he got from the Prime Minister, that is all matters to the Liberals.

He did not give the workers a bridge to the future. He gave them a bridge to the unemployment lines, 1,000 of them. One-third of the workers at Algoma in Sault Ste. Marie have now lost their jobs after the Prime Minister paid to have those jobs shipped abroad. How is it that he could have been so irresponsible with the money of hard-working Canadians that he would pay a corporate CEO \$400 million to send 1,000 jobs south?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to quote a Conservative leader who is actually in office, the Premier of Ontario, we had a choice: save two-thirds of the jobs or let the company go down.

We chose the future. We chose the future for Algoma Steel, so that it can invest in the future, so we can buy Canadian, and so we can build this country. The Conservatives had an opportunity to vote for that future, but they voted against it.

[Translation]

CANADIAN IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the former minister of Canadian identity and culture left cabinet and admitted that he did it to make people think, because the Liberal Party had neglected the progressive wing of the party and because the reason that the Liberal Party had won so many seats was that Bloc supporters voted for it.

Oral Questions

To replace the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, the Prime Minister appointed the member for Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs. Who is going to speak for language? Who is going to speak for culture? Who is going to speak for Quebec?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 44 of our members speak for Quebec. As Prime Minister and as an anglophone, I am going to protect the French language. I am going to protect Quebec culture.

* * *

• (1430)

CLIMATE CHANGE

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, unless the Prime Minister's autocratic tendencies grow stronger, there will be another election one day.

According to the former minister, people voted for climate action, which the Prime Minister claimed to care about, and for trade negotiations. However, the Prime Minister is focused on neither. He is not doing things he said he would do, and he is doing things he never said he would do.

In full transparency, what did he say to his former minister?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to our climate targets. We need major investments, not just rules. We need to invest in clean electricity in Quebec and in nuclear power in Alberta and Ontario. We need to invest in carbon storage. We will do all of that.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister thinks that nuclear power is clean energy. The Prime Minister is removing the caps and limits on greenhouse gas emissions, particularly for electricity generation. The former minister also said that once the support of the base is lost, it is very hard to get it back.

For his own sake, will the Prime Minister abandon his oil agenda, go back to his climate agenda, and take an interest in Quebec?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are going to strengthen our climate agenda. We have just begun to invest in the sector. For example, the budget now includes \$4 billion for Hydro-Québec and clean electricity through investment tax credits. This is the beginning of a major clean energy project.

* * *

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberals love to give corporate bailouts and handouts to companies that ship jobs out of our country. Now, we learn that the Liberal government has pledged \$15 billion or \$1,000 for every tax-paying family in Canada, people who cannot afford food, to Stellantis.

Investment is fleeing this country almost as fast as the Prime Minister is running out the back door of Parliament right now. Why will he not—

The Speaker: The hon. member knows that was offside.

We are going to have to go to the next question, which is also that of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister gets angry and runs out the door rather than answering questions about the cost of \$15 billion out the door, or \$1,000 for every tax-paying family, to a company that is shipping jobs out of the country. Why is he sending our dollars away and our jobs away while he runs away?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the Conservatives, ever: not today, yesterday or tomorrow, any time they ask questions of members on this side of the House.

Every single member on this side is fighting for Canada. We are fighting for all of our industry. We are fighting for our workers. We are fighting to build Canada strong.

We should all join to defend our workers in the middle of a trade war. We do not need that kind of Conservative politics. We need to stand up for Canada and build Canada strong. I believe in Canada.

• (1435)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot stand up for workers if he cannot even stand up in the House of Commons.

The finance minister is the one who signed the sweetheart \$15-billion subsidy—

The Speaker: Order. I did not hear the beginning of the question. The member did lose one question, but I would like him to start from the top on that one.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot stand up for workers if he cannot even stand up and answer my questions. The finance minister has not stood up for workers either. He signed a \$15-billion sweetheart subsidy deal with Stellantis, and now that same company, taking our tax dollars, the equivalent of \$1,000 for every family in Canada, is shipping the jobs to the United States of America.

The industry minister says she has not even read the \$15-billion contract. Has the Prime Minister even read the contract, or did he simply look at the \$15-billion deal and say, who cares?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians who are watching at home are looking at someone who has only ever made one deal: to come to this House.

On this side of the House, we have always stood to make sure we will build this country. We will attract investment. The member should be ashamed. Ask a Canadian when the last deal was that he brought to this country. Ask him when he created one job in his country apart from his own.

On this side of the House, we will always stand for workers. We will bring investment. We will build the strongest economy in the G7, because we believe in Canada. We are going to fight every single day for Canada.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are going to go and report the Prime Minister to the witness protection program, because he refuses to stand in this House and answer about his government's expenditure of \$15 billion, \$1,000 for every Canadian family, to one company, supposedly to create jobs. That same company now ships those jobs south of the border, and the government is covering up the contract.

Yesterday, we learned from the company that it does not have any reason to redact the contract, so why does the government not release the full details of the contract, so that Canadians can find out how badly the Prime Minister ripped them off?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three points.

First, the member should ask the member for Windsor—Tecumseh—Lakeshore on his side of the House whether she agrees with what he says regarding the Stellantis workers in Windsor.

Second, when it comes to the documents, the committee members will have access to all the documents. That is a moot question.

Third, when it comes to what is happening with Stellantis in Brampton, we had a contract and Stellantis broke the contract. We will get our money back.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): I have three points, Mr. Speaker, about this \$15-billion bailout and handout. The minister did not read the contract, she did not read the contract and she did not read the contract. How can she possibly claim she is going to get the money back, when she does not know what legal powers are in the contract because she admits she did not read the contract?

My question for her is this. As families are lining up at food banks because they cannot afford food, how does she justify charging every single household \$1,000 for a handout to a company shipping jobs south of the border?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I did not admit that; second, I read the contract, and third, the committee members will have all the details.

That being said, what we will do is fight for these jobs. We know that the workers are affected in the auto sector and the steel sector by the unjustified and unjustifiable American tariffs. We will make sure that we get these jobs back in Canada, and we will fight for every single job.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to stand with the Unifor workers in Brampton, who were out in the rain and the cold. There was not a Liberal around and not a word from the Prime Minister. All of them wanted to know what was happening with their jobs. The Liberals had given money to Stellantis for that plant and \$15 billion to Stel-

Oral Questions

lantis for another plant, and those workers out in the cold, unable to afford their mortgages, were wondering how it was possible for the Prime Minister to give \$15 billion without even guaranteeing their jobs.

Does he have the courage to stand up now and explain it to their face?

• (1440)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not need any lessons from the Conservatives when it comes to courage and standing up for workers who are unionized.

That is why I was in Brampton, along with the workers, and that is why I was even talking to Lana Payne a bit earlier today. What was she telling me? She was telling me how when Harper and the Conservative government at the time, in 2009, decided to bail out GM and Chrysler, they did nothing to protect the workers. That is the Conservatives' record when it comes to the auto sector.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Well, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister asked an interesting question: "Who cares?" "Who cares?", he asked. He is not there, so he does not care.

The Speaker: I assume the member meant that somehow metaphorically. Maybe next time, he will not use so many metaphors.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, it was a metaphor, just like all those Liberal promises.

Unfortunately, today we learned even more terrible news. The Domtar workers in British Columbia have lost their jobs, as a 30th mill has closed under the Liberal government. The Prime Minister promised that he would get a deal to end the tariffs, and those tariffs have tripled, all while he removes the legal challenge against the illegal softwood lumber tariffs.

How is it the Prime Minister broke his promise and sold out our lumber workers?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member opposite has realized there is a trade war. That trade war is creating challenging times for the people of Crofton, and we understand that.

I was on the phone with the CEO today working on new solutions to retool that mill. I was on the phone with the minister of forestry looking at new fibre solutions for the mill. We are standing up for the forestry industry. The Conservatives just complain.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to build a single economy. He did not lie because he did build a single economy, a dirty oil economy out west. Not one inch of the pipelines he wants to impose under the pretext of standing up to Donald Trump will be built during Trump's presidency, but they will pollute for 40 years. This is a betrayal not only of Quebecers, but also of countries that have not given up the fight against climate change.

How can the Liberals look themselves in the mirror?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about how we are going to build a country, a strong Canada, we are talking about projects like hydroelectricity in Iqaluit. We are talking about the high-speed train that would connect Toronto and Quebec City. That will allow us to use Canadian steel and aluminum. These are very important projects. We have many others, such as graphite mines in Quebec. These represent good jobs in Canada and a very strong future for our country.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite what the minister says, Quebecers did not vote for the Liberals so they could give up on climate action and turn Canada into global problem. They also did not vote for the Liberals to get a pipeline rammed down a province's throat. They did not vote for the Liberals to make our children live through a growing number of natural disasters. Quebecers did not vote for that, and a lot of Liberals did not sign up for that either.

Are they not fed up with drinking the Kool-Aid?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning that the separatist movement wants to impose a loyalty test on Quebec artists. I wonder if the Bloc Québécois supports this approach. That might come as a surprise because the Bloc asked for absolutely nothing in the last budget for the cultural sector. Separatists do not have a monopoly on Quebec loyalty and pride.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the new Minister responsible for Official Languages was only in his position one day—not 10 days, five days or even two days—before he said that he was fed up with hearing about the decline of French in Quebec. As Mathieu Bock-Côté so aptly put it, “it's the federal Liberals' usual denial, disdain and contempt toward the future of French in Quebec.”

Does the Prime Minister realize that he made a huge mistake by appointing his most incompetent MP to handle the sensitive issue of French in Canada, and in Quebec in particular?

• (1445)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the member opposite, no one in

Canada believes that Pierre Poilievre will protect the French language in Quebec or elsewhere—

The Speaker: I think the minister knows he made a small mistake, but he can continue.

Hon. Marc Miller: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment. Let me put it this way: I am sure that this year's member for Carleton will stand up for French better than last year's member for Carleton did.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain: The Leader of the Opposition would never have appointed a unilingual anglophone Governor General. We are fed up on this side of the House. We are fed up with Justin Trudeau's former ministers. We are fed up with ministers who broke Canada's immigration system, fed up with a minister who refuses to acknowledge the decline of French and fed up with a minister who does not care about Quebec culture.

When will the Prime Minister be fed up with this minister too?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after spending 10 years on the other side of the House, I can understand why they are fed up. They must be fed up with voting against dental care, official languages legislation and renewable energy in Quebec.

They must be very fed up with losing three, soon to be four, different leaders.

* * *

[English]

STEEL AND ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government handed Algoma Steel \$400 million and got zero Canadian jobs in return. Now 1,000 workers in Sault Ste. Marie are getting pink slips just weeks before Christmas. Worst, the Liberals knew about these layoffs, and they wrote them the cheque anyway. They looked steelworkers in the eye and promised to fight for them. The promise turned out to be a \$400-million lie, and the Liberals knew it from day one.

Can anyone over there explain why corporate welfare matters more than Canadian jobs?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is pretty clear that those Conservatives would not have lifted a hand to help save our steel industry in Canada.

That is pretty clear from the nature of the questions, but more than that, do members know what happens when someone loses their job? It is a time of panic. That is why we extended EI for 20 weeks for long-tenured workers. The Conservatives will mock this because they voted against it. They voted against the very supports that people need in times of stress.

Canadians know that we have their backs in the good times and the bad.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister needs to get her stories straight. There was \$400 million given to executives at Algoma Steel, but there was zero for the people who actually make the steel. That means that a thousand people are out in the cold at Christmas. Nobody over there has a reasonable explanation for this deal, and this is not the first time that this megadollar mess has been caused.

The Liberal minister already admitted that she does not read contracts. I want to know, did Algoma Steel catch the minister not reading, or is it just that the minister does not care?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the Conservatives do not know much about working together in collaboration, but Doug Ford does. The Premier of Ontario is working just as hard as this government to save those jobs in Sault Ste. Marie. That is why we made a \$400-million loan to Algoma Steel, because we know that those jobs are important, that the company is important to the future of Canada and that we need a sovereign steel industry in this country.

These guys would have let it all go. That is pretty clear.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we found out that the Liberals knew Algoma was planning to lay off 1,000 steel workers before giving the company \$400 million. I guess the Prime Minister was speaking the truth: He really does not care about protecting Canadian jobs.

Do members know who does care? Conservatives care and so do the thousands of Hamilton steel and manufacturing workers who go to bed every night wondering if they are going to have a job in the morning.

Why is it that, with these Liberals, there is always a guarantee for corporate welfare but zero guarantees for the Canadian worker?

• (1450)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when my colleague is talking about corporate welfare, what I am saying to him is that workers are worth every dime, particularly Algoma ones in light of the American unjustified tariffs.

That is exactly why we decided, along with the Conservatives in Ontario, with Doug Ford's government, to support the company as it was facing an existential threat. The company was not going well. We knew we needed to help. We decided to make the investments, and meanwhile, we know that the future can be brighter because we are working on two things: a steel plant and a plate mill for defence and infrastructure.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

SPORT

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer, Canadians from coast to coast to coast cheered on Victoria Mboko, the young tennis sensation from Burlington, Ontario, when she won the National Bank Open.

Can the Secretary of State for Sport explain how this inspiring performance reflects Canada's growth as a sport nation and the importance of making tennis and all sports accessible to everyone?

Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Terrebonne for that excellent question.

The extraordinary success of Burlington's pride and joy, Victoria Mboko, at the National Bank Open reminds us how essential it is to make sports accessible to all Canadians.

That is why our government has championed sport as a project in the national interest. Victoria's success proves that when we invest in sport, Canada wins. We will build a strong sports system that our nation can be proud of.

* * *

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is time for some facts on the Stellantis contract in the Brampton assembly plant. The fact is that the former minister of industry did not read the contract and, as a reward, was promoted to finance minister. The fact is that there is no job guarantee in this contract, or it could not have laid off 3,000 workers. The fact is that the Liberals gave \$200 million to Stellantis with no conditions. Even Ontario did not advance the money exactly because of that. The fact is that 3,000 auto workers in Brampton are out of work and struggling to make ends meet.

How the hell are the Liberals so incompetent?

The Speaker: Let us be careful about some of the words we use. People are watching at home. Their kids are watching.

The hon. Minister of International Trade.

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of facts, including creating opportunities for the workers in Brampton, here are some facts: the Prime Minister secured a \$70-billion investment from the U.A.E. into Canada; the German navy has committed \$1 billion for Canadian-made defence equipment; Finnish Nokia recently broke ground on a new \$340-million facility in Ottawa; and, few weeks ago, Malaysia Petronas signed a 20-year deal to secure energy from Canada.

This is what is creating opportunities for workers looks like.

Oral Questions

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that answer is unbelievable. We have a minister who did not read a contract, who admits he did not read the contract, and he was promoted to become the finance minister. The Liberals talk about a job guarantee for workers in Brampton, and there clearly is not. As Christmas approaches, 3,000 assembly workers in Brampton are out in the cold collecting EI.

The Liberals talk about some contracts and other things, but they are doing nothing to get the workers back into their plants. They talk about extended EI. I have met with those workers. They want to be in the plant. They want their jobs back.

What are the Liberals doing to get the jobs back for those workers?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is what is believable: It is 37,922 jobs through 15 procurement projects across this country and \$106.3 billion of investment in our defence sector. The opposition should clamp down on the negativism, help build this country forward, get behind our defence sector and get behind our defence industrial strategy. Let us grow this economy for our people and our future.

• (1455)

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after being ordered to hand over their multi-billion dollar subsidy deal with Stellantis unredacted, the Liberals refused, with senior officials blaming the company, stating that Stellantis had outlined every redaction they had felt to be necessary and that they were, “comfortable with the redactions they proposed.” The problem is that Stellantis has now gone public, saying it never asked for the documents to be blacked out.

Will the minister tell us why her officials lied to committee and Canadians?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, they are calling down Canada. They are calling down Saskatchewan. As the Leader of the Opposition pontificates from the comfort of Stornoway, our leader, the Prime Minister of Canada, is busy fighting for every inch of trade opportunity in this changing world.

The men and women on this side of the House are helping win that fight, and Canada is going to continue that fight, with or without the opposition.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised Canadians he was going to negotiate a win with the Americans and that he could handle Donald Trump. Well, not only has he failed to get a deal, but softwood lumber tariffs have tripled under his watch and he has unilaterally abandoned legal challenges against these tariffs. Now, another mill on Vancouver Island is closing, killing nearly 1,500 direct and indirect jobs. They do not want handouts; they want to keep working.

When will the Prime Minister finally keep his promise to get a lumber deal so forestry workers stop losing their jobs?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we said, we are in a trade war. It is hurting the people of Crofton, and it is hurting the entire forestry industry. That is why we were on the phone with company officials, talking about how to retool the factory, and that is why we were on the phone with the Minister of Forests in B.C., looking at fibre solutions.

The Conservatives complain; we do the work. We are standing with the forestry sector.

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, devastated, gutted and heartbroken are just three of the emotions I felt after learning that 375 Canadians would be losing their jobs with the closing of the Crofton mill. These are Canadians with mortgage payments and with young families, Canadians who were already struggling with the rising cost of living before receiving this terrible news.

The government promised to support our workers and secure market access for our goods. Instead, lumber tariffs have tripled, and thousands of Canadians have lost their jobs.

If the Liberals' so-called plan is really working, can they guarantee that no more mills in Canada will close as a result?

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative member needs to take several seats.

In my riding on Vancouver Island, people know that we are supporting the softwood lumber industry. Whereas the Conservatives' plan is to get out of the way and to do nothing, our government is investing in—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The member may keep going, but not from the top.

Hon. Stephanie McLean: Mr. Speaker, in my riding of Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke and on Vancouver Island, folks know that the government has the back of the softwood lumber industry and its workers, whereas the Conservatives would do nothing. Their plan is simply to get out of the way, whereas we are providing real support.

• (1500)

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 375 workers at our local Crofton mill are losing their jobs 10 days before Christmas: 150 jobs gone in Chemainus and 165 jobs gone in 100 Mile House. Thirty-one B.C. towns have been gutted so far because the Liberals broke their promise to get a deal.

What is the Prime Minister's take on stalled talks? "Who cares?", he said; there is no "burning issue". Well, the people who lost their jobs yesterday care, and their families know this is a burning issue. After these latest losses, why should anyone trust the Prime Minister to get a softwood lumber deal?

Hon. Jill McKnight (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the softwood lumber industry is incredibly important to British Columbia, and we stand with the workers, the 375 individuals. We are here to stand with them. British Columbia knows the importance of this industry, and the federal government is going to invest in it to support it.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this morning the radical ex-minister of the environment, and Greenpeace stuntman, said, "I sincerely doubt that the new pipeline will ever get built." As the head of the Liberal "keep it in the ground" caucus, he has continuously poured cold water on the MOU, saying that there is no project, no route, no consensus and no private sector proponent. The former minister knows what the Prime Minister will not admit: that the west coast tanker ban makes any project impossible.

Will the Prime Minister repeal the tanker ban so we can get our resources to market, or is the new pipeline really just a pipe dream?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should speak with the Premier of Alberta, who seems very hopeful that we can work together. Rather than putting Canada down, we can work together to build this country in an environmentally responsible way in partnership with indigenous peoples. That is how we build Canada strong.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not serious about building a pipeline. His former orange-jumpsuit minister has said that an MOU with Alberta was not an approval of a pipeline. He knows that a decade of his government's anti-resource-extraction laws has made it impossible to find a private sector proponent.

Just like the NDP Premier of British Columbia, the Prime Minister is hiding behind a tanker ban that blocks Canadian resources from getting to market and will block any future projects, all while U.S. tankers can sail freely through the very same Canadian waters.

Will the Prime Minister admit that the last decade of Liberal rule has been a failure, and repeal all the stupid, job-killing Trudeau laws?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to listen to the members of Parliament from Alberta is to get a taste of real dejection: real dejection that a prime minister of Canada and a premier of Alberta put their signatures to a solemn document that creates major possibilities in renewable power, in electricity generation, in carbon sequestration, in resource development and in making Canada a renewable and conventional energy superpower. They are pretty disappointed about that.

Oral Questions

Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister disrespected chiefs by shutting them out of the MOU consultations and discussions with Alberta. The Prime Minister talked down to first nation chiefs yesterday at AFN for 20 minutes about not breaking trust. Then he completely ignored all questions from Alberta first nations.

The Prime Minister is breaking trust with first nations, investors, Albertans, British Columbians, his caucus and his own cabinet on whether he will build a pipeline or not. Will he show real leadership by committing to a pipeline today, or will he just continue to divide Canadians?

Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government continues to respect and acknowledge the important work they are doing as first nations leaders across this country.

Our ministers have been busy all week listening to rights holders and going to the meetings. I, as a former Assembly of First Nations National Youth Council member and a former regional chief, know the important work that goes into the development of resolutions and all the different debates they have.

Our government is listening, and we look forward to building our country together with first nations.

* * *

● (1505)

[Translation]

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

Tim Watchorn (Les Pays-d'en-Haut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a world-class aerospace industry, particularly in Quebec. Our aerospace sector will play an invaluable role in our efforts to build the strongest economy in the G7. It generates \$15 billion in GDP and provides more than 40,000 jobs in Quebec.

The budget implementation act contains important measures to protect and strengthen our aerospace sector. Quebecers want these measures to become reality.

Could the Minister of Finance remind those who are blocking and delaying the passage of the budget implementation act how they are harming Quebec's aerospace sector?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 really is full of good news. Just look at the smiles on the Conservatives' faces.

Oral Questions

Our budget sends a clear message that the aerospace industry is a strategic national asset. Canada is one of the few countries in the world with a thriving aerospace industry, thanks to the talent, expertise and know-how of our workers.

In budget 2025, we are making generational investments in defence that will support the aerospace industry. In a dramatic turn of events, the Bloc, which claims to champion Quebec, is going to vote against Quebec's interests in the budget. That is a disgrace and an affront.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday when responding to questions about the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report on housing, the Prime Minister lectured Canadians, saying, "they do not know numbers." Then the housing minister said that the Parliamentary Budget Officer was just wrong on his numbers. Let me give them the numbers again. Can they solve the following equation?

The Prime Minister promised 500,000 new homes a year, but his housing bureaucracy will deliver only 5,200 homes per year; that is 99% less than promised, so can the minister tell us where the rest of the houses will come from?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the PBO report assumes that none of the current affordable housing programs continue. That is what would happen if the Conservative Party were in government. It has never delivered on affordable housing before, and it never will again.

We are already working with provincial and territorial ministers to put together the next generation of the national housing strategy. It is a team Canada approach. We are doing the work to renew our investment in affordable housing, something the Conservatives will never do.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if bureaucracies built homes, after 10 years we would all be living in a penthouse like the minister. What he fails to understand is that behind the numbers behind the crisis are real Canadians of the next generation, shut out of the Canadian dream to earn, to save and to own a home. In the GTA, housing starts are down 43%, and sales are down 65%.

When the Prime Minister told young Canadians that they need to sacrifice more, why did he not have the courage to tell them what he really meant was to sacrifice the Canadian dream?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is rich to hear this from the party that has stalled the first-time homebuyers' GST cut since June. That is five months that the Conservatives have been stalling up to \$50,000 for first-time homebuyers so they can afford their first home. It was on the floor of the House starting in June; they have been delaying it.

If you want to deliver affordability for young Canadians, put your vote where your mouth is.

The Speaker: I have mentioned many times that one has to speak through the Chair, or the Chair may get offended.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

[Translation]

G rard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, every Canadian had access to affordable housing. The dream of home ownership was alive and well. After 10 years of mismanagement by this Liberal government, rent has doubled and home ownership is inaccessible. That dream is crumbling.

Now, the Liberals have come up with a new scheme called Build Canada Homes. The Parliamentary Budget Officer was scathing. The objective of Build Canada Homes was to build 250,000 housing units. However, according to the PBO, this program will really only build 25,000 homes, or 10 times fewer. That is the result.

Why is this government so good at building bureaucracy?

● (1510)

Hon. Jo l Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, every housing organization heaved a sigh of relief to see that Stephen Harper's 10-year reign was finally over, since the Conservatives completely neglected this issue and got out of the affordable housing game altogether. By way of evidence, their own leader oversaw the construction of only six affordable housing units. It is really unbelievable to see that these Quebec members have such an optimistic view of their own party. They are out of touch with reality.

On this side of the House, we have invested historic amounts in affordable housing. The Parliamentary Budget Officer is not taking into account the continuation—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, after weeks of Conservative delays, the justice committee finally resumed its work on the combatting hate act, and we will continue that work on Thursday.

Will the Conservatives make sure bail reform is passed before Christmas? Could the minister speak to the importance of keeping this work moving so Canadians can have these important justice reforms take place?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have been clear that they want stronger protections in the face of rising hate and that they want meaningful bail reform. After weeks of Conservative delay tactics and stalling in committee, I am really happy to see that they might move forward on the combatting hate crime legislation on Thursday.

However, when it comes to bail reform, the Conservatives are complete hypocrites. Our bail reform legislation would make sentences harsher for criminals, and it would end bail for serious and repeat offenders, but of course the Conservatives do not want that to pass, because then what would they use for their clickbait to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauce.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my father promised me that if I worked hard, I could buy a house and have a nice place to raise my family. Can I promise the same thing to my daughters today? The answer is no.

Over the past 10 years, the Liberals have doubled the cost of homes and housing. What are the Liberals doing to solve the problem? They are creating more bureaucracy with Build Canada Homes, which would build housing at a cost of \$3.2 million per unit. That is really very impressive.

Will the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure stand up and admit that his program is a total failure, yes or no?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the total failure is the Conservatives who voted against a budget that makes historic investments in housing and that lowers taxes for 22 million Canadians and for first-time buyers of a new home. That is the total failure, and it is clearly on that side of the House.

* * *

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is telling Canadians to sacrifice during the jobs crisis. Liberals have no money to sign pharmacare agreements or meet their housing promises, but today we find out they gave \$400 million to Algoma Steel when they knew it was cutting 1,000 jobs. They gave \$100 million more than they admitted to Stellantis, which cut 3,000 jobs.

Why did the Liberals give half a billion dollars to companies that just eliminated 4,000 Canadian jobs?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the member opposite talks about affordability for Canadians, I just want to remind the House that it is the International Day of Persons with Disabilities, and we have members here in Ottawa today who work so hard to make sure that people with disabilities have full opportunities to

Points of Order

participate in the workforce, something we should all take seriously.

That member voted against the very fund that supports that work. He also voted against the Canada disability benefit. People should be putting their money where their mouth is and standing up for Canadians who just want a fair shot at participating.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to cite the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, fourth edition, 2025. I would ask you to turn to page 525, paragraph 13.28, where it states, “Allusions to the presence or absence of a member during proceedings of the House are unacceptable.” It is very clear.

This is important and I would ask that you report back to the House on what we witnessed during the 10th question, when, I believe, the leader of the official opposition was in contempt of the—

• (1515)

The Speaker: I am familiar with that rule. In fact, it cost a member a question today, but I will look into the 10th question and get back to the House if necessary.

The hon. member for Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has to do with the previous point the member for Winnipeg North raised.

I would like you to look back at the tapes. When the leader of the official opposition started reading from a budget book, you said it was being used as a prop. I think you, Mr. Speaker, need to analyze the use of official resources. Whether it be this fine fourth edition of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* or a budget book, I think we need some consistency. If someone is directly reading from a text in order to make a point, I think it should be allowed in this place.

The Speaker: I see the situations as being a bit different, but we will get back to the member on that. The hon. member had to read the standing order; he does not know it by heart.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from December 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-225, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: It being 3:17 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-225, under Private Members' Business.

[Translation]

As this is the first recorded division to be taken on an item of Private Members' Business in this Parliament, I would like to take this opportunity to explain the procedure.

The recorded division will be taken row by row, beginning with the sponsor of the item, whether the member is participating in person or by video conference. Then I will ask the other members who are in favour of the motion to please rise, beginning with the back row on the side of the House on which the sponsor sits. If a member is participating by video conference, they will indicate whether they are voting for or against the motion when their name is called. This is consistent with the practice that was in place before the electronic voting system was launched.

After we have gone through all the rows on this side of the House, the hon. members on the other side of the House will have their turn to vote, starting again with the back row. Those opposed to the motion will be called in the same order. Unless members are present in the chamber, all members, including the sponsor, will cast their votes using the electronic voting system or by raising their hand at the end of the vote in the event of technical difficulties.

● (1530)

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

*(Division No. 51)***YEAS**

Members

Abouttaif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Anstey	Arnold
Au	Auguste
Baber	Bailey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Bardeesy
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Blois	Bonin
Bonk	Borrelli

Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Cobena	Cody
Connors	Cooper
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dalton
Dancho	Dandurand
Danko	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
DeRidder	Deschênes
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Gallant	Garon
Gasparro	Gaudreau
Gazan	Généreux
Genuis	Gerretsen
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Grant
Greaves	Groleau
Guay	Guglielmin
Guilbeault	Gull-Masty
Gunn	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardy	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Ho	Hodgson
Hogan	Holman
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jackson	Jaczek
Jansen	Jivani
Johns	Joly
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khanna	Kibble
Kirkland	Klassen
Kmiec	Konanz
Koutrakis	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Kuruc	Kwan
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux

Lantsman
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Mahal
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle
May
McCauley
McKelvie
McKnight
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Melillo
Mendès
Michel
Miller
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Naqvi
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
O'Rourke
Patzner
Perron
Plamondon
Powlowski
Rana
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Rocheffort
Rood
Rowe
Ruff
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Schmale
Sgro
Shiple
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Small
Solomon
Steinley
Stevenson
Strahl
Sudds
Thériault
Thompson
Tolmie
Uppal
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Vis
Warkentin
Waugh
Wilkinson
Yip
Zerucelli
Zuberi — 325

Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Lawton
Leitão
Leslie
Lightbound
Lobb
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Maloney
Martel
Mazier
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Calgary Centre)
McPherson
Ménard
Menegakis
Miedema
Mingarelli
Morin
Morrissey
Myles
Nater
Nguyen
Normandin
Olszewski
Osborne
Paul-Hus
Petipas Taylor
Poilievre
Ramsay
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Robertson
Romanado
Ross
Royer
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Seeback
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sodhi
Sousa
Ste-Marie
St-Pierre
Strauss
Tesser Derksen
Thomas
Tochor
Turnbull
Valdez
Van Popta
Vien
Villeneuve
Wagantall
Watchorn
Weiler
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Private Members' Business

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Bendayan
Kelly	LeBlanc
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	McKenzie
Motz	Oliphant — 8

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

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

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL STRATEGY ON FLOOD AND DROUGHT FORECASTING ACT

The House resumed from December 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-241, An Act to establish a national strategy respecting flood and drought forecasting, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading of Bill C-241 under Private Members' Business.

● (1545)

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

(Division No. 52)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Anstey	Arnold
Au	Auguste
Baber	Bailey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Bardeesy
Barlow	Barrett
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Bittle
Blair	Block
Blois	Bonk
Borrelli	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carney	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chambers	Champagne
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Cobena	Cody
Connors	Cooper

Private Members' Business

Cormier	Coteau	McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Dabrusin	Dalton	McKnight	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Dancho	Dandurand	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson
Danko	Davidson	Melillo	Ménard
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Niagara South)	Mendès	Menegakis
Dawson	Deltell	Michel	Miedema
d'Entremont	DeRidder	Miller	Mingarelli
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers	Moore	Morin
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Morrison	Morrissey
Diab	Diotte	Muys	Myles
Doherty	Dowdall	Naqvi	Nater
Duclos	Duguid	Nathan	Nguyen
Duncan	Dzerowicz	Noormohamed	Ntumba
Earle	Ehsassi	Olszewski	O'Rourke
El-Khoury	Epp	Osborne	Patzer
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Paul-Hus	Petitpas Taylor
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)	Poilievre	Powlowski
Fancy	Fanjoy	Ramsay	Rana
Fergus	Fisher	Redekopp	Reid
Fonseca	Fortier	Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Richards	Roberts
Freeland	Fry	Robertson	Rochefort
Fuhr	Gaheer	Romanado	Rood
Gainey	Gallant	Ross	Rowe
Gasparro	Gazan	Royer	Ruff
Généreux	Genus	Sahota	Saini
Gerretsen	Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Sarai	Sari
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Sawatzky	Schieffe
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Schmale	Seebach
Gladu	Godin	Sgro	Sheehan
Goodridge	Gould	Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Gourde	Grant	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Small
Greaves	Groleau	Sodhi	Solomon
Guay	Guglielmin	Sousa	Steinley
Guilbeault	Gull-Masty	Stevenson	St-Pierre
Gunn	Hajdu	Strahl	Sudds
Hallan	Hanley	Tesser Derksen	Thomas
Hardy	Harrison	Thompson	Tochor
Hepfner	Hirtle	Tolmie	Turnbull
Ho	Hodgson	Uppal	Valdez
Hogan	Holman	van Koeverden	Van Popta
Housefather	Hussen	Vandenbeld	Vien
Iacono	Idlout	Viersen	Villeneuve
Jackson	Jaczek	Vis	Wagantall
Jansen	Jivani	Warkentin	Watchorn
Johns	Joly	Waugh	Weiler
Joseph	Kayabaga	Wilkinson	Williamson
Kelloway	Khalid	Yip	Zahid
Khanna	Kibble	Zerucelli	Zimmer
Kirkland	Klassen	Zuberi— 303	
Kmicc	Konanz		
Koutrakis	Kram		
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis		
Kuruc	Kwan		
Lake	Lalonde		
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Lantsman	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lattanzio	Bonin	Brunelle-Duceppe
Lauzon	Lavack	Champoux	DeBellefeuille
Lavoie	Lawrence	Deschênes	Fortin
Lawton	Lefebvre	Garon	Gaudreau
Leitão	Leslie	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Larouche
Lewis (Essex)	Lightbound	Lemire	Normandin
Lloyd	Lobb	Perron	Plamondon
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Ste-Marie	Thériault— 22
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)		
Mahal	Malette (Bay of Quinte)		
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Maloney		
Mantle	Martel		
May	Mazier	Anand	Bendayan
McCauley	McGuinty	Kelly	LeBlanc
		Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	McKenzie

NAYS**Members****PAIRED****Members**

Motz

Oliphant— 8

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

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

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the deferred recorded divisions, the time for Government Orders will be extended by 28 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

• (1550)

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following three reports: the report of the Canadian delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly, respecting its participation of the 24th winter meeting in Vienna, Austria, on February 20 and 21; the report of the Canadian delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly respecting its participation at the meeting of the ad hoc committee on migration in Madrid and Canary Islands, Spain, on March 20 and 21; and the report of the Canadian delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly, respecting its participation at the OSCE PA 32nd annual session in Porto, Portugal, from June 29 to July 3.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament in relation to the motion adopted on Monday, November 24, 2025, regarding the quorum and mandate of the committee.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (York South—Weston—Etobicoke, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development: the second report, from the Subcommittee on International Human Rights, entitled “Enduring and Overcoming: The Struggle of the Hazaras in

Routine Proceedings

Afghanistan”, and the third report, entitled “Supplementary Estimates (B), 2025-26”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the second report.

* * *

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-258, An Act to amend the Criminal Code to address the Supreme Court of Canada decision in *R. v. Jordan*.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to respond to the Supreme Court's 2016 ruling in the *Jordan* case and perhaps more specifically to the report of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime, which was tabled a few weeks ago in November. The report found that the administration of trials is a significant issue. More than 268 sexual assault trials have had to be dropped since 2016 because the time limits set by the Supreme Court could not be met. We are proposing a solution to this problem, and we hope to get all members of the House on board with our proposal.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

SAFE CONSUMPTION SITE

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise, again, on behalf of angered parents who are concerned about the horrible actions of BC Housing, which is proposing a safe consumption site across from the high school track at Abbotsford Traditional School.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to enforce its agreement with the Province of British Columbia, which does not allow for hard drugs to be done in the vicinity of a school. They are calling on the federal government to cease all funding to BC Housing until this situation is rectified.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition from Canadians who are concerned about recent attacks on churches and other places of worship across our country. The petitioners advocate that freedom of religion is protected under the charter, and they emphasize that all Canadians should be able to worship in safety, free from violence, vandalism or intimidation.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to condemn these attacks, take stronger measures to prevent and respond to them, ensure that perpetrators are brought to justice and affirm Canadians' commitment to protecting religious freedom for all.

Government Orders

PUBLIC SAFETY

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to table a petition on behalf of the residents of Abbotsford—South Langley who are deeply concerned about the increasing prevalence of organized crime, extortion, shootings and intimidation in our community. Recent daylight shootings, homicides, and other violent incidents underscore a broader systematic public safety crisis in our country. The petitioners mourn the death of Darshan Singh Sahsi.

These residents call upon the Government of Canada to reinforce the process of public reporting so Canadians can clearly see how the federal, provincial and local municipalities are working together to prevent further increases of violent and organized crime.

• (1555)

HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of Canadians who are concerned about human rights protections in India. The petitioners are saying that, according to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, various actors are supporting and enforcing sectarian policies to establish India as a Hindu state.

The petitioners are stating that Christians in India are being targeted by extremists, who are vandalizing their churches, attacking church workers, and threatening and humiliating their congregations. The petitioners are also stating that crimes against the Dalit group are on the rise. They note as well that Indian Muslims are at risk of genocide, assault and sexual violence.

The petitioners are asking the Government of Canada to ensure that any trade deal with India is premised on mandatory human rights provisions, that extremists are sanctioned and that the Government promote a respectful human rights dialogue between Canada and India.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition I have is from Canadians from across the country who are concerned about the MAID regime here in Canada, or the government-assisted dying program. They are concerned that the lives of those who have a disability or chronic illness are not being valued, and they are concerned about the tacit endorsement of the notion that a life lived with a disability is optional or dispensable.

They are calling on the Government of Canada to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting medical assistance in dying for those whose prognosis for natural death is more than six months.

HEALTH CARE

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise virtually today to present a petition of deep concern to constituents in Saanich—Gulf Islands, and I dare say, across the floor and in all corners of this place. Petitioners ask the House to take note of the fact that nearly five million Canadians currently lack a family physician. They ask the House to press the government and the government to work with the provinces and

territories to address the worsening situation of access to family medicine practitioners.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472 and 473 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

AN ACT TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL ON THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The House resumed from October 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-13, An Act to implement the Protocol on the Accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-13.

Government Orders

Before I commence my comments on this very important bill, I want to advise the House that I will be dividing my time with the member for Kings—Hants.

We have earnestly been discussing in this House, at an unprecedented time in our history and since perhaps the end of the Second World War, a tremendous rise in protectionism when it comes to the international trading order. We have spent the last 80 years or 85 years, since the end of the Second World War, creating a system that has championed free trade among countries, especially countries that are like-minded and democratic, to ensure that we have fewer barriers between the countries and that our goods and services can move more freely.

Many would argue it is not free trade per se, but that it is more liberalized trade or trade that is based on rules, in other words a rules-based trading system. However it is categorized as an appropriate categorization, because, from an economic principles perspective, it has allowed countries to really be able to leverage their competitive advantage.

Countries that are good at producing one thing can produce more of those goods or services and then exchange them with another country that may have a natural advantage in some other goods or services. This has allowed us all to collectively grow our economies and specialize in things that are good for us and help to create strong economies and good-paying jobs.

These free trade arrangements have also allowed us to put in rules, so we are not just dealing in isolation. We have rules in place around how to trade and to bring tariffs down so it is easier to export and import things, so they are cheaper for consumers. Having these free trade agreements has allowed for a dispute resolution mechanism in cases of dispute. This takes away what would have happened in previous times, when countries would engage in wars to resolve those disputes. We now have dispute settlement bodies that can do so as a matter of legal recourse based on these treaties.

However, what we have seen for the last couple of years, which has unfortunately been led by the United States, is a trend toward protectionism again. We have seen a trend toward imposing tariffs that has been causing tremendous hardship, as we are seeing from our experience here in Canada with Canadian workers and industries. This is not only counterproductive but also really bad for our economy and the economies we trade with, like that of the United States.

This is why we have a really important choice before us: whether we also enact protectionist policies and emulate what we see being done by the United States with imposed tariffs and the closing down of borders, or whether we pursue further liberalization with other like-minded countries and pursue other markets that are also quite keen to do business with Canadian companies and businesses, so we can create good-paying jobs for our workers right here in Canada.

I am of the view that we need to focus on the latter. What we need to do is continue on the path of further liberalization, of engaging and entering into agreements with other countries, so we can reduce barriers, reduce tariffs and allow for more Canadian businesses to do business, whether it is selling our goods or ser-

vices or attracting investment to Canada so we can help support them. That should be our focus.

• (1600)

I really do feel we need to double, triple and quadruple down on that side of the equation, while also working with the United States to make them realize that the agreements we have had with them for a long, long time have been really good for our collective economies. First, there was the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, then NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and then, subsequently, CUSMA, the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement.

In fact, 85% or so of our goods that get exported to the United States are still covered under CUSMA and are tariff-free, but of course, we need to continue to make sure those affected industries like automotive, lumber, and steel and aluminum are part of that free trade regime as well.

At the same time, this has been a really important moment of reckoning for Canada to really realize that we need to diversify our trade, that we need to look at other parts of this world to do more business. We cannot just be relying on the United States as our only or biggest market, as we have done up to this point, because, as we have seen, it could have a very serious impact on our businesses and on the respective communities that we all represent in the House.

That is why our government has really set a target of doubling our non-U.S. exports over the next decade. This means doubling it to about \$300 billion in other parts of the world, which, of course, requires a lot of hard work. It requires that we engage with other countries that are growing, where the businesses are growing and the middle class is growing, and create opportunities for our businesses to be able to do work there.

This is why this bill is a very important step, because it is putting in place the accession protocol for the United Kingdom to become part of the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, also known as CPTPP. This agreement, which Canada is part of as a founding member, has 11 countries that are part of it. By growing that agreement through including the United Kingdom, we are again creating more opportunities for our businesses to take advantage of this comprehensive trading relationship and have preferential access to a market like the United Kingdom.

As we know, the United Kingdom is really important to Canada in many respects, not only from a historical perspective but also for our businesses to have that very important access to that market. If we couple that with our agreement with the European Union, the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, CETA, this gives a tremendous opportunity for Canadian businesses to do business and sell things into such markets. This is why I really feel strongly that this bill is an important bill to pass, so that the United Kingdom can become part of the CPTPP.

Government Orders

However, our work is not stopping there. This is why we are negotiating with ASEAN countries and hope to complete that negotiation by next year. I was in Malaysia on behalf of the government, working with ASEAN countries to ensure that we can finish that agreement by early 2026. This is why we have resumed our conversations with Mercosur countries as well, which is extremely important. We have also launched trade negotiations with Thailand, the Philippines and India, so that we can open those markets as well. Most recently, we finished negotiations with countries like Indonesia and Ecuador.

We are doing a tremendous amount of work so that we can diversify our trade and create more opportunities for Canadian businesses to do business in other parts of the world. I think it is good for our economy. It is going to pay huge dividends, and this bill, Bill C-13, is a very important step in that direction. That is why I urge all members to support it. If the United Kingdom can be part of CPTPP, this will allow Canadian businesses to do more business in the United Kingdom and other member states.

• (1605)

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, while a deal with the U.K. is certainly better than no deal at all, we have been put in this position because the Liberals, frankly, failed to maintain a better deal that we already had, which was the CETA agreement, the agreement that the Harper government negotiated with the European Union and that we had been trying to maintain with the United Kingdom. CETA is a much more liberalizing deal. It provides more market access for Canadian goods and services. It provides more labour protections for workers in Canada and the EU, and would have done so with the United Kingdom.

Why could we not keep the better deal we already had?

Yasir Naqvi: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to serve with the member on the Standing Committee on International Trade.

I think the member is quite aware that there were quite a few complications when it comes to CETA being extended to the United Kingdom, with Brexit and all the politics around that. He is right that CETA is a very good agreement, and I am glad the Canadian government has engaged in CETA. Unfortunately, it is still not ratified by all member states. I believe Ireland most recently recognized it, and we are working really hard to make sure that the remaining nine countries of the European Union also ratify CETA so that it is fully implemented.

This bill is a very good step toward making sure the U.K. accedes to CPTPP, because it is going to create tremendous benefits for Canadian business.

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague opposite a question. Regardless of the substance, we have already said that we are in favour of this agreement, despite certain details that we can examine together in committee. I hope that he will vote with me against some of the more contentious aspects. However, that said, we are in favour of the agreement itself.

What does he think about the fact that the government has not complied with its own policy on the minimum number of days between the announcement of an agreement and the moment it is presented in the form of a bill before this Parliament?

[*English*]

Yasir Naqvi: Madam Speaker, this is an important bill. As I said, the Prime Minister has made a commitment to the British Prime Minister that we will be moving forward with their accession to this agreement. We feel strongly that it is in the best interest of all Canadian businesses, whether they are based in Quebec or other parts of the country, that this bill be passed and that the United Kingdom, from the Canadian perspective, accede to and become part of the CPTPP. That is why we are moving forward with this bill.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am wondering if my colleague and friend could provide his thoughts in regard to the Prime Minister's talk during the election about expanding trade opportunities beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border.

This is a substantive piece of legislation that speaks to that point. It is so critically important that when we talk about putting Canada first, building Canada strong and making Canada the strongest country in the G7, it means that we need to double our exports in the coming years. It is such a critical thing for all of us.

I wonder if my colleague could provide his thoughts in regard to the bigger picture of the issue.

Yasir Naqvi: Madam Speaker, the member raises a very good point: Just talking about it is not going to make it happen.

Since the election, look at the amount of work we have done. We have moved ahead with the accession of the U.K. into the CPTPP, finalized the negotiations with Indonesia and Ecuador, resumed our negotiations with the countries of ASEAN and Mercosur, started negotiations with Thailand, the Philippines and India, and made an arrangement with the United Arab Emirates in terms of having an investment protection protocol. There are a few more.

All this work is happening in tandem, so that we can really put into effect the trade diversification strategy that is so needed as we lessen our reliance on the United States and give more opportunities to Canadian businesses to create good-paying jobs for Canadians right here at home.

Government Orders

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, we see how these trade deals have played out, and we want to make sure we have trade deals that support workers. We see right now big oil, big banks and big grocery posting record profits while people get squeezed at the till and at the pump when they try to cover their costs.

The Brits charge an excess profit on the runaway greed of oil and gas companies. Will the Liberal government finally tackle the runaway corporate greed and create an excess profit tax, like Britain did?

Yasir Naqvi: Madam Speaker, most of our treaty agreements support and benefit small and medium-sized companies. If we look at the Trade Commissioner Service, 75% of the businesses it supports are SMEs.

These agreements help businesses in our communities and create good-paying jobs locally.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to speak to Bill C-13, which is for the accession of the United Kingdom to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. CPTPP is the initialism we use, and it is a relatively straightforward bill. The CPTPP has 11 original countries. Canada is a founding member of the trans-Pacific partnership, alongside countries like Australia, Chile, Mexico, Singapore, Brunei, Japan, New Zealand, Vietnam, Malaysia and Peru, and the United Kingdom would be the first non-foundational member to join the CPTPP.

I think it is important for the House, obviously, to talk about the relationship between Canada and the United Kingdom and the relationships we are seeking to forge with deeper ties in the Indo-Pacific and with growing economies where we would have the ability to export the products that the world needs in either goods or services. It should be incumbent on all members of Parliament in the House to, yes, scrutinize the legislation that is before us, but also to not take undue time and slow this bill down, because ultimately, when we think about the allies and partnerships that we have, one of the most mature relationships we have is with the United Kingdom.

I want to use my time today to talk about a bit of the background on the CPTPP and about some of the trade-related opportunities and issues between Canada and the United Kingdom, but then also give a bit of a local perspective as the member of Parliament for Kings—Hants. I also want to talk about the issues and opportunities that I think both governments, whether in London or here in Ottawa, can use to continue to forge that very great partnership that has existed with our mother Parliament and ultimately with our constitutional monarchy through the United Kingdom.

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

One in five jobs in Canada depends on free trade. This means that the free trade and our partnerships around the world are absolutely critical. That is why the Prime Minister is working so actively with our ministers to forge strong, meaningful relationships globally and to make sure that people in other countries wake up in the morning thinking of Canada.

[*English*]

It is easy to think that people maybe wake up in the morning and think about Canada. We should be very proud. As a G7 country, we have what the world wants. We have contributed on the global stage, but the world is a big place. The work the government is doing ensures that countries are increasingly thinking about Canada as a reliable trade partner. That is the work that is happening.

[*Translation*]

Our goal is to double our exports outside the U.S. market. Of course, the U.S. market is vital to our economy, as 75% of our goods and services are exported to the United States. Nevertheless, we need to build economic resilience. We must therefore find other international markets to strengthen the resilience of our manufacturing sector and our economy as a whole.

[*English*]

The United Kingdom is our third-largest trading partner, and the government has been focused on the ways we can continue to increase and deepen that trade. I heard a question from the opposition benches in the first round of debate that suggested that Canada does not have an existing bilateral agreement with the United Kingdom. I am here to assure and to reassure that opposition member that we do have an existing agreement on the bilateral that is an extension of the United Kingdom's leaving the European Union. I think that is important to recognize, and that member will have a great opportunity to be able to ask questions. If he thinks he is so smart in the House, he can ask those questions. I look forward to it.

Of Canada-U.K. trade, 99% is tariff-free. There are small irritants that exist, but I do think they are important. I represent a rural riding, an agricultural riding. I had the opportunity to talk to His Excellency High Commissioner Rob Tinline, who is the United Kingdom's high commissioner to Canada, about some of the market access issues that we have around beef products.

There are two issues that relate to the exportation of beef from Canada to the United Kingdom. This is an issue with the European Union. I know our government benches are working on engaging on this to be able to find a solution forward. The first issue is hormones in beef. There is an industry standard in North America. Objectively, I think that may be the harder one to overcome. The second one is around carcass wash. There is a North American standard with respect to rinsing or carcass washing. There is no good reason, by the way, that the United Kingdom or the European Union should not be welcoming and trying to bring top Canadian beef to those markets.

Government Orders

We have opened up and had opportunities for British beef in Canada. We certainly support our friends and farmers across the way. They should equally be opening up those markets. I know the Prime Minister had the opportunity to talk to Prime Minister Starmer about that. It may seem small, but it is important in this context. We should look at the broader relationship, but these are some of the irritants that we believe need to be removed to be able to move forward.

For me, this is personal. I am wearing today an Annapolis Valley tartan tie. My family's ties run through the United Kingdom. The first Blois to come to North America was Abraham. He served with the 84th Highlander regiment. Sarah was his wife. They settled after the war. They had a land grant in the Kennetcook valley. Blois is not that common a name here in Canada, but most of the Bloises we find originate out of the Maritimes, from the beautiful small community of Gore, Nova Scotia. My wife is a British dual citizen and a Canadian citizen at the same time. She has family in Scotland.

When I think about the ways we can continue beyond the trading relationship and deepen the people-to-people ties that already exist, I see some opportunity in the days ahead for the two governments to look at labour mobility. We have skilled workforces on both sides of the pond. If there are British workers who want to come and serve Canadian companies, we should be finding pathways to do that more easily through our immigration programs. Likewise, there are many Canadians who have ties to the United Kingdom who may be able to contribute for a short period of time or may want to spend some time there. How can we look at more labour mobility? I think there is merit in that. There is certainly merit in looking at financial regulations and professional services.

Of course, we speak two official languages here in Canada.

● (1620)

[*Translation*]

English-speaking Canadians enjoy particularly easy access to the U.K. labour market. It is straightforward to practise law, accounting and other similar professions there.

[*English*]

There are a lot of similarities with respect to regulation and harmonization of professions. We can do more on this.

The next one is around regulatory harmonization. When I was briefly the minister of agriculture in the Prime Minister's first cabinet, one of the things we thought about, and I know the current Minister of Agriculture shares this view, was being able to work with other trusted jurisdictions. When we think of the United Kingdom, when we think about its regulatory processes, notwithstanding what I said on beef, where we are perhaps not pleased about the carcass wash, we know there is a scientific rigour to the way in which it undertakes its regulatory processes and its approvals. If, for example, there is a sheep vaccine approved in the United Kingdom, I am confident it should be readily available for Canadian sheep farmers.

We have a lot of work we can do on those types of regulatory pieces around crop protection products, vaccines for animals, ani-

mal feeds and tools for our farmers. That is one area I think we can deepen. It does not have to be and of course it is not contained in Bill C-13, but when we think about deepening that partnership, those are some areas I would like to see.

Another is research between agencies like Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the CFIA and others. We can do a lot of that. I know there are existing partnerships, but they can be built upon, particularly in the circumstances we find ourselves in.

With respect to tourism, a lot of us think about the United Kingdom. I think we have to make sure that the Brits are thinking about Canada, particularly Atlantic Canada.

The last piece I am going to say is a quick stat for members. At the end of World War II, every single apple that was sold in London came from the Annapolis Valley. It is a source of pride. We think there is more opportunity, whether with respect to wood pellets, apples or agriculture, to get goods into the United Kingdom.

I see that I am at the end of my time. I look forward to taking questions from my hon. colleagues.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the hon. member for really connecting his speech to his riding.

I want to ask the hon. member about the country of origin quotas, which expired 18 months ago. I am going to provide him with the example of Canada Goose, which I believe he is familiar with. It is a Canadian company that generated \$75 million of revenue in the U.K., but paid \$10 million in duties last year, with that figure projected to climb to \$15 million in duties this year, which, of course, is a significant burden for that business.

It did not have to be that way, and I am wondering what the hon. member is going to do about it.

● (1625)

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I am not too proud to stand in the House and say that I was not aware of that particular circumstance. The member, obviously, is well steeped in that particular issue as it relates to Canada Goose, which is what I heard was the company.

As I mentioned in my speech, 99% of the trade between Canada and the United Kingdom is tariff-free, and it comes down to destination originators and trademarking. If the hon. member would like to see me after this and have a conversation, I am happy to make sure that gets to the Minister of International Trade and the appropriate authorities so we can look into this issue to see what we can do to help support that great Canadian company.

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question that was just posed. Canada Goose is located in Winnipeg North. It has a very substantial footprint and employs hundreds of individuals. I can assure my colleague and the member who asked the question that this is something the government takes very seriously as we try to resolve all sorts of outstanding issues that prevent the exports of fine, wonderful, world-class Canadian-made products.

When we look at the importance of the trade file in general and of sending a very positive message, as a collective House, by saying this is legislation that we should be advancing, there really is no justification for sitting on it indefinitely. This is not the first time we have debated the legislation.

I am wondering if the member would concur that passing substantive legislation of this nature sends a positive message to the people we are trading with. It shows Canada's willingness to not only secure trade agreements but also to enact them where we can.

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I would agree in the sense that, as I mentioned, the United Kingdom is one of our closest friends and allies. This is an important signal. We do not want to be talking about this bill deep into 2026. The House of Commons should debate this, get it to committee and, ultimately, to the Senate as soon as possible.

Let me use this opportunity to also say that this is not the only piece of legislation before the House. We have significant criminal reform legislation, a multitude of different bills that matter to individuals in our community and matter for public safety. I have to assume, because I hear questions from the other side, that we need to do something to tackle violence in our communities with criminal reform. We need to move all of that legislation before Christmas. There is no good reason why we cannot get that bill to committee and get it back.

I would invite my Conservative colleagues and all opposition members, and not only for Bill C-13, to clear the deck before Christmas and show Canadians we are getting work done.

Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, whom I have a lot of respect for. I like his choice in ties. We have a heritage commonality, which brings up the fact that we are discussing trade with the U.K.

I know one of the member's previous files, which he holds near and dear and close to his heart, is agriculture. I would like to hear his thoughts on the imbalance of trade between Canada and the U.K. with regard to the exports of beef and pork. We are hearing there was \$30 million in imports in the first half of this year, and last year Canadians were allowed to export only \$25,000. I would like to hear his thoughts on that.

Hon. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I will return the compliment to the member on his beautiful vest. We like the tartans. I know he has heritage in the United Kingdom as well.

I touched a bit in my speech on the imbalance on beef trade. The hon. member is right. I should have included pork as part of that. This is something the government needs to continue to focus on. I

do think Parliament needs to ultimately move forward with the accession legislation for the United Kingdom to help support a friend and ally, but we need to continue to push the United Kingdom on access. There are significant beef and pork exports coming this way. We have not been able to realize the benefits of the trade the other way. Yes, there are lots of good things to highlight and we should not get stuck on singular issues like this, but as it matters to beef farmers in this country, whether in Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan or across this beautiful country, we need to keep fighting for that.

I know the Minister of Agriculture has been engaged on that. I have had personal conversations with the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I know she is going to be raising it as well, as has the Prime Minister. We need to stay on that.

● (1630)

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Bow River.

I rise today to speak to Bill C-13, an act to implement the protocol on the accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership. It may be a technical bill filled with tariff schedules, statutory amendments and trade protocols, but it represents something deeply important: the partnerships we build between nations.

Conservatives have always believed in free and fair trade. We know that open markets, clear rules and reliable partners drive prosperity. The United Kingdom's accession to the CPTPP would strengthen that rules-based framework and deepen our trade with a close ally that shares our democratic values, our legal traditions and our belief in opportunity through enterprise, so yes, there is some good to be found in the bill.

However, support does not mean silence, because while the agreement is long overdue, Liberal trade policy is riddled with big announcements, poor follow-through and a willingness to please foreign governments while leaving Canadian citizens and businesses behind. Many of my colleagues have spoken more directly to these Liberal failures, but today I want to focus on an issue that affects more than 2,800 people in my riding and thousands more people across Canada, which is the frozen pensions of British Canadians.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Can we allow the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith to make her speech, with respect?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Order. There will be no heckling, period.

Government Orders

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Tamara Kronis: Madam Speaker, I have no doubt that some of my colleagues will speak more directly about the Liberal failures and the problems with the bill, but I want to focus today on an issue affecting more than 2,800 people in my riding and thousands more people across Canada, which is the frozen pensions of British Canadians.

For 75 years, the U.K. has refused to provide annual increases to the state pensions of British retirees living in Canada. More than 105,000 pensioners already face this injustice, with hundreds of thousands more Canadians aging into it. They paid into the U.K. national insurance system their entire lives. They earned their pensions.

However, because they moved to Canada, a Commonwealth ally, their pensions are frozen at the amount first received, in some cases decades ago. If they had moved to the United States, to Israel or to the Philippines, they would receive their annual increases. About 60% of British pensioners living overseas get their annual increases, but 40% do not. It is a lottery that is based not on contribution or need but on geography, and Canadians are inexplicably on the losing end of this.

The U.K.'s Department for Work and Pensions admits that fixing the problem for British retirees in Canada would cost only about 13 million British pounds, which is about \$24 million, of a total U.K. pension budget of 146 billion pounds. Therefore this is not a question of cost; it is a question of will.

I have met pensioners in their seventies, eighties and nineties surviving on payments at levels set in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Canada honours its obligations to our pensioners living in the U.K. by indexing their pensions. The upshot is that Canadian taxpayers are subsidizing a moral failure by one of our oldest allies.

The world has changed, our trade has certainly changed and our lives have changed; however, this unfair policy remains. The U.K. remains the only OECD country that pays pensioners differently based on where they live. It is an outdated, discriminatory relic from another era.

Successive MPs from my community have raised this issue over the last decade. The House has passed motions. Past Canadian governments have asked the U.K. to reopen discussions on this issue. The U.K.'s pensions minister has said no every time, which seems to be a pattern in Liberal trade negotiations.

Meanwhile, the U.K. has signed new reciprocal social service agreements with Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein, but not with Canada, a country that stood shoulder to shoulder with it through wars, through peacekeeping and through generations of shared sacrifices. This is not how friends treat each other.

This is where partnership really matters. If the U.K. wants to benefit from the CPTPP, then it should also act like a partner, by honouring fairness, reciprocity and human dignity. It is a conundrum, yet I cannot help but think, "if only". If only we had a prime minister with deep connections to the United Kingdom, someone who understands economics, banking and pensions. Wait a minute; I seem to recall that our current Prime Minister is not only a former

governor of the Bank of England but also the man who arranged for the King to deliver the throne speech of this very Parliament.

The Prime Minister may be friends with kings, but he has failed the commoners on this issue. The Prime Minister waxes poetic about transformational change and extols generational investments and structural reforms, but if he truly wanted to be transformational, he would start with this generation: the seniors who built the country he once served and who now suffer under an unfair, outdated policy. If the Prime Minister cares, if he wants to show that his talk about values and fairness is more than just a slogan, he should use his connections to fix this, because it is a burning issue for British seniors who have chosen Canada as their home.

The Prime Minister needs to understand that transformational leadership does not just happen in jets or hotel lobbies, or swanning around English parties. It happens when we stand up for real people who are being left behind. I ask the Prime Minister to come down from on high to see these people, the British pensioners of Nanaimo, Ladysmith, Vancouver Island and from across Canada, whose income has not risen in 30 years. Some of them split pills. Some skip meals. All of them deserve our help. They are the people who built the very democracy that allows us to debate the bill today.

• (1635)

If the Prime Minister had a functioning constituency office in his riding, he would know that this is an issue that affects his community too. If the Prime Minister truly believes in fairness, he should pick up the phone. He should call his old colleagues in London. He should call the King and explain the issue as I have, and put it back on the agenda. He should pursue justice and get a deal.

The Canadian Alliance of British Pensioners has worked tirelessly to raise awareness of the issue. The pensioners are not asking Canada for new spending; they are asking for their government to negotiate justice for them from the United Kingdom.

The CPTPP is about rules-based trade and mutual benefit. Let it now show that it is also about fairness, reciprocity and moral responsibility.

I want to close with this. The 2,845 people with frozen pensions in Nanaimo—Ladysmith, and the thousands more across Vancouver Island and the rest of Canada, have not been forgotten. Their government may not always fight for them, but today I lend them my voice and this platform for their cause. They worked hard, they played by the rules and they deserve justice.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister has the relationships, the platform and an immense amount of privilege. He should use it and bring the issue to the fore in his discussions with the U.K. He should raise it at every level, because justice is not measured in economic models or global summits. It is measured in the lives of real people, in this case the thousands of Canadians who are also British pensioners, who chose Canada to be their home, against their own self-interest, and who deserve our support in remedying this injustice.

• (1640)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the expectations that the Prime Minister has are actually fairly extensive. The Prime Minister, right out of the gate, instantly dealt with substantial policy measures, whether it was tax breaks, building one Canadian economy or looking at trade opportunities that go beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border. There have been a lot of things that have been happening in the few short months that he has been Prime Minister.

To try to imply that the Prime Minister does not care about pensioners does a disservice in regard to the issue, I think. I would ask the member opposite this: Has she actually written or done anything to demonstrate to the government some concern by crossing over and talking to the Prime Minister about the issue she was just talking about, or has she written or talked to other ministers?

It would be great if the member could answer that, but the real question I have for her is this: Can we anticipate that the Conservatives have some good faith within, in terms of recognizing the value of trade for Canada and of building trade opportunities, and that the legislation will pass before the end of the year?

Tamara Kronis: Madam Speaker, on the question of whether or not the Prime Minister is aware of this particular issue, I will say that if he reads his email, he would know that the British pensioners were actually here a couple of weeks ago. They had a Hill day. They had a suite. All MPs, including the Prime Minister, were invited to come by, and they had extensive briefings on the issue. If the Prime Minister chose not to include that in his schedule because he had things to do that he considered more important, then I suppose that answers the member's question on its own.

In terms of the value that Conservatives place on trade, we have fought many elections on the issue. We have negotiated many free trade agreements, and we obviously care about free and fair trade. We believe earnestly that, had Canadians given us the opportunity to do so, like former prime minister Harper, who negotiated a softwood lumber deal within 80 days of becoming prime minister, we would have produced more results than the Liberal government has in the time since it was elected.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to ask my colleague a question, because her answer provided a nice segue. She just talked about the negotiations that took place under the government of Prime Minister Harper. However, that government also adopted a policy on introducing and tabling agreements and treaties in Parliament. Currently, that policy is not being followed, given that the government introduced the bill within a shorter period than re-

quired by this policy. This policy is supposed to enable us to do our work more effectively.

What does the member think about the government's failure to comply with the existing policy, which is still available on the Government of Canada's official website? Does she believe that a policy is not enough and that we need legislation like the one the Bloc Québécois is proposing in Bill C-228?

[*English*]

Tamara Kronis: Madam Speaker, I wish I could answer the hon. member fluently in French. I am working on it.

I am a new member of the House, and one of the things that actually astound me about this Parliament is how little the Prime Minister's office and the government actually involve the House in making laws and making decisions. I would have thought that the Liberals' calls for collaboration and requests that we pass legislation before Christmas and work with them on their legislative agenda would have been accompanied by genuine efforts to sit down with us and engage us on their policies. Unfortunately, I find that that rarely happens.

An exception, which I was actually quite pleased with, was when the member for Terrebonne approached me a few weeks ago to lend my support to her bill, which we just voted to send to committee this afternoon. When the government approaches us to work together, we do have something to contribute, and it would be wonderful if the Liberals actually listened.

• (1645)

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak to Bill C-13 and the impacts it would have on cattle producers, especially in my riding of Bow River, but first I want to recognize the storied history and legacy of ranchers in southern Alberta.

The beef industry has long been vital to the region. Since the late 1800s and the era of open grazing, the herds of the Circle Ranch, the Bar U and many others have grazed the expanse of Bow River. People homesteaded there and built lives on the harsh prairie.

As D. Lorraine Andrews writes in her book, *Ranching Under the Arch*, about life on the ranch, "In reality it represented a uniquely hybrid combination of Old and New World culture, skill and expertise, heavily influenced by American, British and Eastern Canadian know-how and adapted to a frontier environment that demanded adaptation for survival."

In her remarkable story of a people and a landscape, one that helps to explain southern Alberta's uniqueness, Andrews makes clear that the land and the people cannot be separated. She also writes, "They made the rangelands their home, conserving and preserving the land for generations to come. In the process, they were instrumental in establishing the vibrant and successful ranching industry that remains a fundamental part of our history and our future as a province [and a country]."

Government Orders

This goes to the heart of what I want to get at today, which is how what may seem a small part of a trade agreement is in fact large, because it goes to the cultural fabric.

The influence of ranchers on southern Alberta can be seen in countless ways, for example in the Calgary Stampede, established in 1912 to honour the end of open-range ranching, and in the preservation of vast stretches of native fescue grasslands. Today, the 160,000-acre McIntyre ranch, established in 1894 in southeastern Alberta, remains home to the largest tract of fescue grassland in North America. These were, and are, true stewards of the land, calving through snowstorms, fixing barbed-wire fences and holding on to the promise of spring. It means hard work, long days and an unwavering commitment to ensuring that food reaches Canadian tables.

Once again, Canada's farmers are being left behind by the Liberal government's incompetence on trade, or its laziness. Bill C-13 is supposed to strengthen our partnerships and expand trade through the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, or the CPTPP. Make no mistake, the CPTPP is a good agreement. It offers real opportunities to grow Canada's trade footprint, and Conservatives support that vision, but under the Liberal government, those opportunities are being squandered.

The Liberals have had nearly a decade to fix the barriers harming our farmers and producers, and there has been no progress, only neglect. Let us look at some facts. The U.K. exported over 16 million dollars' worth of beef to Canada in 2023, over \$42 million in 2024 and over \$28 million in just the first half of 2025. Meanwhile, Canadian beef exports to the U.K. were just over \$85,000 in 2023, \$25,000 in 2024 and zero, not a single dollar's worth, in 2025.

The situation is just as bad for pork. British pork exports to Canada rose from \$5.6 million in 2023 to \$9.1 million in 2024 and another \$3.6 million in the first half of 2025. Canadian pork exports to the U.K. were zero in 2023, only \$75,000 in 2024 and \$122,700 this year. That is not free trade; it is one way. It is not bilateral; it is preferential.

Now the Liberals are asking Parliament to approve the U.K.'s accession to the CPTPP. This is without fixing a single one of these problems, and they are giving the British everything they want while Canadian farmers are getting little in return. This is not a negotiation; it is surrender.

The Canadian Cattle Association has been crystal clear: Terminate the failed Canada-UK Trade Continuity Agreement and return to the negotiating table, because right now there is no continuity for Canadian beef. The only market access is for British exporters.

● (1650)

The U.K. continues to block Canadian beef using a hormone ban that the World Trade Organization ruled against nearly 30 years ago. It refuses to recognize Canada's world-class meat inspection system, a system trusted by dozens of other trading partners. The carcass wash has been mentioned, and the Canadian standard is arguably far higher than that of the U.K. It is also a fallacy to blame EU requirements, as the U.K. has left the EU. It is a non sequitur.

What have the Liberals done about it? Nothing. Not a single kilogram of Canadian beef has been sold into the U.K. in 2025, yet the government calls this progress. This is not progress; this is failure. The Liberals had years to stand up for our farmers and fix these barriers. These problems and irritants are not new. Instead, they chose the photo ops over results. They let the U.K. walk away from negotiations, ignored clear warnings from producers and are now rushing to rubber-stamp this deal without securing anything for Canadian agriculture.

Conservatives believe in free trade. We always have, but we also believe in fair trade, trade that works for Canada and not against it. This is not just about tariffs or paperwork; it is about the livelihoods of hard-working farmers and ranchers who feed this country and feed the world. When their shipments are blocked and their access to markets is cut off, it means less income, fewer jobs and more uncertainty for rural communities. It is especially egregious when these non-tariff barriers are such flimsy excuses.

This is the difference between keeping the family ranch afloat or just shutting down, so I ask the government, why did it allow British beef unlimited access to Canada while Canadian producers cannot sell a single kilogram to the U.K.? Why is the government tolerating non-tariff barriers that violate science-based trade rules? Why did we let the U.K. walk away from negotiations that were supposed to protect Canadian interests? The government has failed Canadian farmers under CETA; it has failed forestry workers on softwood lumber; it has failed our energy sector, and now it is failing our beef and pork producers under this agreement.

Conservatives will not stand by while rural Canada pays the price for Liberal negligence. We will support trade agreements that expand opportunity, not agreements that reward protectionism abroad and punish production here at home.

Government Orders

While we are talking about fairness, there is one more group the government has ignored. This has been spoken about by my colleague already. There are more than 100,000 U.K. pensioners living in Canada. These seniors paid into the system. They paid their whole lives, but because the U.K. refuses to index their pensions, even though it indexes them for those in the United States and elsewhere, their incomes shrink every year as inflation rises. We know inflation is a problem in Canada.

Given the Prime Minister's close relationship with the U.K. Prime Minister, members would think he might have used this opportunity to stand up for these pensioners. Instead, there is silence. Conservatives believe in strong, principled trade, trade that strengthens our economy, supports farmers and delivers results for Canadians. We will hold the government accountable for its failures and stand up for the producers, ranchers and workers who make Canada competitive on the world stage. Under a Conservative government, Canada will not settle for bad deals; we will fight for better ones.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it sounds as if the Conservatives might be voting against the legislation. The member wants to talk about farmers and cattle farmers. I had a wonderful experience when entrepreneurs from the Philippines came to Canada and participated in the Calgary Stampede. The Minister of Agriculture met with the owner of what I believe is the Wildflour Restaurant. It is a chain of restaurants in the Philippines. They are now selling Canadian beef, recognizing that the best beef in the world is likely in the province of Alberta. It may even be in Manitoba, and I am not giving up on my Manitoba beef producers, but let us stick with Alberta right now, given that the member is from Alberta.

I can tell members something. The Minister of Agriculture is one of Canada's greatest ambassadors in advocating for our products, whether it is Alberta beef or P.E.I. potatoes, and we see that in the trade discussions we are having. I would suggest to the member that he might be a little inaccurate when he tries to portray the false impression that the government is not doing its job in terms of promoting agricultural products.

I am seeking clarification from the member. Does he support the passage of this legislation?

• (1655)

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, the comments and questions from the member opposite are truly one of the greatest pleasures to experience in this House.

Alberta beef, and Canadian beef worldwide, is noted for its quality. It is sought out by the world because it is the best beef in the world. However, I think the member misunderstood. I was not talking about the Philippines and the partners that we already have in the trans-Pacific partnership. I was talking about the U.K. and the opportunity the government has right now to ensure that we have fair, equal, equitable, reciprocal trading with the U.K. The U.K. has been obstructing Canadian participation in their market for a very long time, for very flimsy reasons, and its desire to have access to the trans-Pacific partnership is the perfect opportunity to apply the appropriate amount of pressure to get our beef into the U.K.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Madam Speaker, I apologize because you must be getting sick of hearing my voice, but I have not received an answer yet. I asked two members on both sides of the House the same question. I will ask it again now.

What does my colleague think about the fact that the government did not follow the existing policy, the public policy adopted under the Harper government, if I am not mistaken, that there should be a 21-day waiting period between announcing an agreement and tabling it in Parliament?

In this case, it took 15 days. Therefore, the government did not comply with the existing policy.

Does that not show that what we need is a law, not just a policy?

[*English*]

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, I have come to learn that a very common feature of questions in the House is for members to ask them repeatedly and still not get an answer.

I apologize that I do not have a clear opinion. I am just not well versed in the circumstance of the previous reality. It seems reasonable, but I do not know for sure.

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am a cattle producer myself in Saskatchewan, where we actually raise probably the best beef in the world. We export it to Alberta for feeding and processing.

Trade is very, very important to the Canadian beef industry. We have seen the cattle herd in Canada reach its lowest level since the fifties because we have had 10 years of horrible policy from the Liberal government. Now we are facing tariffs from China; we are facing tariffs from India.

I want to ask my hon. colleague, who just gave an excellent speech, if he can lay out some of the real-world impacts of trade policy and why policy matters.

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Likewise, being an Alberta beef producer, I have some difference in opinion as to where the best beef in the world comes from. This is not an opportunity for a schism in the caucus, but it is a great discussion.

Policy matters. That is what I was trying to get at in the gist of my speech, that it is about the people, their life and their attachment to the land, and the fabric that that composes of our country. When it impacts negatively even small portions of our population, it has a ripple effect and impact.

Policy has to be done right. Policy has to be thoughtful. It has to be fair, and it has to be executed. We need delivery on results.

Government Orders

● (1700)

Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

The subject of Bill C-13 is near and dear to my heart. My parents, who passed away last year, were both from the U.K., both from Scotland. They would have said that there was a negative trade balance when they moved over here, but they always reminded me that I was made in Canada with Scottish parts and that it is a great country to live in here.

I want to be able to say today that Conservatives support free trade because Canada is a trading nation. While the current government was busy with photo ops and virtue signalling, eight of our CPTPP partners were busy doing business with the world's sixth-largest economy. Yes, I said "CPTPP". It is a difficult acronym, but I got through it on the first round, so hopefully I will get through it for the rest of the speech. They were dealing with the sixth-largest economy, and Canadian businesses were left waiting at the dock.

Having studied at King's College London in the U.K., I understand first-hand the deep economic and cultural ties that bind Canada and the United Kingdom. The U.K. is not just another trading partner. No, it is one of our oldest and most reliable allies, which makes the government's fumbling even more inexcusable.

Today, I will outline three critical failures: one, the economic opportunity cost of Liberal delays; two, the damage to Canada's international credibility; and three, the pattern of trade negligence that is hurting our exporters, in particular my own riding of Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan.

The numbers do not lie. The U.K. is the world's sixth-largest economy, and it is the first European country in CPTPP. Eight countries are already trading under new terms while Canada waits and waits, and Canadian exporters are losing the competitive advantage.

However, there is an even more troubling pattern here. Under the trade continuity agreement, the U.K. has not been acting fairly toward our pork and cattle producers. The U.K. objects to carcass washes applied at Canadian slaughter plants and opposes the use of growth promotants in beef and pork production. The trade statistics tell the real story of the Liberal government's failure to stand up for our producers. Britain exported over 40 million dollars' worth of beef into Canada in 2024 and nearly 30 million dollars' worth in the first half of 2025. In comparison, Canada exported to Britain just 25,000 dollars' worth in 2024 and, to date, has no beef exports in 2025. For those who are watching, that is 25,000 dollars' worth in 2024, which is unbelievable. This is not fair trade. This is a one-way street that favours British producers, while our farmers and ranchers face non-tariff barriers designed to shut them down.

As a mayor, I learned that economic development happens through work, not announcements. We attracted major investment to Moose Jaw by rolling up our sleeves and delivering results, \$1.3 billion of results in six years, not by staging photo ops but by standing up for our community and for our businesses. The government has forgotten that lesson.

● (1705)

The U.K. and Canada share more than just a monarch; we share values, institutions and centuries of partnership. From Vimy Ridge to Afghanistan, we have stood together. Now, when it comes to trade, we are making them wait while we sort out our bureaucratic mess.

During my time at King's College London, I witnessed Britain's commitment to innovation, enterprise and global engagement. The U.K.'s decision to join CPTPP represents exactly that forward-thinking approach. Meanwhile, Canada is dragging its feet like we are still debating whether trade is good for the economy.

Canada held the CPTPP chair in 2024 but failed to lead. Other nations celebrated at the Vancouver meeting while Canada remained uncommitted. Given the Prime Minister's close relationship with the U.K. Prime Minister, one would have thought they might have used this opportunity to advocate on behalf of our agriculture producers. How can we lecture other countries about trade rules when we cannot even ratify agreements on time with our closest allies?

Real leadership means delivering results, not just good headlines. As a mayor, I did not cut ribbons until the projects were actually built. The government announces everything and delivers nothing. The minister needs to answer some tough questions: Why have the Liberals not secured any benefits for our cattle producers? How do we prevent this embarrassment with our allies again?

At the municipal level, we understood that investors have options. If we did not act quickly and professionally, they would go elsewhere. The same applies to international trade. Our partners will not wait forever for Canada to get organized.

When Conservatives form government, we will not just talk about trade; we will deliver results. We will restore Canada's reputation as a reliable partner to allies like the United Kingdom. We will negotiate to allow fair market access for Canadian products and stand up for our industries and our agriculture producers. We will put Canadian exporters first, and we will remember that our friends deserve better than bureaucratic delays.

Having experienced both British excellence in education and the practical demands of municipal leadership, I know what real partnership looks like. It is built on reliability, competence and mutual respect, qualities the government has forgotten. This bill should have been passed months ago. The Liberals' delays have cost jobs, hurt our reputation with a key ally and weakened our position in the fastest-growing region in the world.

As Conservatives, we intend to support the expansion of trade markets for Canadian products. Canadian businesses and our British partners deserve leaders who act with urgency, not a government that is always a day late and a dollar short, or maybe I should say a pound short. We will continue to point out the government's failures to secure wins for Canada, its producers and those who are relying on the Prime Minister to keep his promises.

I would be very happy to take any questions, and I am very interested in further discussion with regard to British pensioners. As I mentioned earlier when I started off, my parents were both immigrants. They came to this country to start a new life, but they also helped build Britain after the Second World War.

• (1710)

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do want to clarify for my hon. colleague that, as I said earlier in debate in the House, the Prime Minister has raised this with Prime Minister Starmer. It is something the government is pushing on.

We do, as a government, share the member's concerns, particularly around the fact that the carcass wash from a North American standard is not being recognized by the United Kingdom, but we have not stopped, as it relates to creating more access. We believe in our Canadian beef farmers. That is exactly why the Minister of International Trade and the Prime Minister were able to secure access to Indonesia tariff-free. Also, the Minister of Agriculture has been doing great work on access to more Canadian beef in Mexico.

Will the member at least recognize that, notwithstanding that we both agree that there is more work that has to be done on the U.K. file as it relates to beef explicitly, there has been market access granted and the government is establishing markets in other jurisdictions that are high-growth, which will matter for Canadian farmers?

Fraser Tolmie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for pointing out that Canada is obviously a global trading partner. However, we have had a relationship with the U.K. that has been broken, and it should not have been. The problem is not new. The problem is the fact that we did not address trade with the U.K. years ago. Therefore this is not a new opportunity; it is just an opportunity that we need to capitalize on, which should have been done years ago.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

I would like to recognize George Marchese for 40 years with Western Roofing, a Kamloops institution. George is a huge fan of the Kamloops Blazers. He helps out with the Scouts and the Kamloops Rugby Club. I thank him for his devotion.

I listened intently to my colleague's speech. He spoke about the impacts on the cattle industry. I wonder if he would like to elaborate on what he has heard directly, on the ground, in that regard.

Fraser Tolmie: Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my hon. colleague again on his private member's bill that passed earlier today. It is very touching, and it does show we can get work done here, whether it is with help from across the aisle or on our own.

Points of Order

Local producers are very disappointed. They feel left out. They have had their challenges over the years, and they feel they have been ignored and neglected by the Liberal government, not only in this trade deal but for years on end.

I heard earlier a colleague from across the aisle talking about how Canadian pork producers were able to sell pork in the Philippines. That is great news, but the thing is that we need to be trading globally. The problem is that we are importing from the U.K., not exporting to the U.K., and that is where we should be going.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the member could enlighten us about the Conservative Party's supporting trade. The last substantial trade agreement we had was the Ukraine trade legislation, and the Conservatives voted against it. On the legislation that is before us, it seems as if, much like with other pieces of legislation, the Conservative Party wants to prevent it from passing, which is somewhat disturbing.

The member says that we should have more trading opportunities, so, first, does he support the legislation? Second, if he supports the legislation, would he encourage his leader and the Conservative brain trust that it is time we allow legislation to actually pass?

Fraser Tolmie: Madam Speaker, first I would like to help my colleague with directions. Britain is that way, and the Philippines are the other way, or maybe it is the other way around: east and west.

Let us talk about the Ukraine deal. We put ourselves at a negative because we were adding carbon tax, and now the Liberals are pulling out of carbon tax. The reason we voted against the deal is that they do not know how to trade, and that is the problem; that is why we are here.

The Conservatives are always going to advocate for Canadian businesses and for fairness in trade deals. That is what we are—

• (1715)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Tobique—Mactaquac is rising on a point of order.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS NOS. 461 AND 470

Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would note that the responses tabled today to Order Paper Questions Nos. 461 and 470 were not signed by any minister or parliamentary secretary. They were in fact signed by the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who is no longer a member of cabinet nor a parliamentary secretary.

Government Orders

Can you confirm, Madam Speaker, that it is not permitted for backbench members who are no longer in cabinet to table documents as if they were still a minister?

Since the responses are now void, Madam Speaker, can you say whether or not the government has met its requirement to table the response to these questions within 45 days, or whether the matter will be referred to committee, as required in the Standing Orders when the government misses a 45-day deadline for Order Paper responses? I have the documents to substantiate that as well.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member for bringing that to the Chair's attention. We will look into the matter and come back to the House with an answer.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

* * *

**AN ACT TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL ON THE
ACCESSION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT
BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE
COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT
FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-13, An Act to implement the Protocol on the Accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the hard-working exporters of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke to speak to Bill C-13, an act to bring the United Kingdom into the Pacific trade deal. As Conservatives, we support free trade and we support the bill; what we do not support is Liberal incompetence.

The bill is a testament to Liberal mismanagement. It is a cautionary tale for Canadians, a warning that the Liberals may not be the crack trade negotiating team they claim to be. They have failed our farmers, they have failed our permanent residents and clearly they are failing to secure more free trade.

We will start with trade. Under Brian Mulroney, Canada negotiated the Canada-U.S. free trade deal and its successor, the North American Free Trade Agreement. During the decade of darkness, under Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin, Canada negotiated just three small deals: with Israel, with Costa Rica and with Chile. What followed was a decade of dynamism under Stephen Harper, and with Stephen Harper, Canada negotiated deals with Peru, Colombia, Jordan, Panama, Honduras, Korea, Ukraine, the 27 members of the European Union and the 11 members of the trans-Pacific partnership.

Our Conservative Party built Canada into the freest trading nation on earth. Unfortunately, things began to change for freer trade after we left office, and the United States pulled out of the trans-Pacific partnership. Under Trudeau, free trade negotiations broke down with India. The deal Trudeau signed to replace NAFTA reduced free trade and even went so far as to ban the American Super Bowl commercials from airing in Canada.

Once America's Republican Party moved away from unwavering support for free trade, the regressive left saw its opportunity. The left has always bitterly opposed free trade. Older Canadians may remember the vicious attack ads the Liberal Party ran, erasing Canada's border during free trade debates. Trudeau nearly derailed the trans-Pacific partnership in order to include new clauses in the agreement similar to the anti-economic development policies he imposed on Canada.

However, the worst was yet to come. After Putin launched his invasion of Ukraine, the Liberals forced that desperate nation to renegotiate its free trade deal with Canada. The Liberal goal was to impose carbon tariffs on Ukraine if the Ukrainians did not increase their own carbon tax to match Canada's. Forcing a country fighting for its very existence to renegotiate an existing deal was truly beyond the pale. It was the kind of diplomacy that would make Tony Soprano proud.

I can already hear my Liberal colleagues clenching their teeth, and I am sure they want to jump to their feet in protest. They would tell us that this is not the old Trudeau government and that it is a new, improved Brookfield government. Although Trudeau was a deplorable prime minister, at least he never ran on a promise to increase tariffs for Canadians.

It has been only 11 months, but the collective amnesia about the current Prime Minister is shocking. The man from Brookfield spelled out his plan on the very first day of campaigning for the Liberal Party leadership. His plan is tariffs. He calls them carbon border adjustments, but that is clearly intended to mislead people into supporting tariffs, and here is how it works. The Prime Minister will dramatically increase the industrial carbon tax, and this will make Canadian industry less competitive against industries of our major trading partners, such as the U.S. or the U.K. In order for these companies to compete, the Prime Minister will impose carbon tariffs and call it a carbon competitiveness strategy.

That is why the Liberals reopened the Ukraine deal; that is likely why they cannot get a bilateral deal with the United Kingdom; that is why we are all pretending that the United Kingdom is now a warm, sunny Pacific island nation that is eligible to join the trans-Pacific partnership; and that is why, during the middle of our recent federal election, the Prime Minister received a warm endorsement from President Trump.

Government Orders

When the President wrote on Truth Social that he and the man from Goldman agreed on many things, we thought they meant they agreed on signing giant novelty decorations or using police as props for photo-ops. What we should have realized is that they agree on using tariffs as a social engineering tool. The U.S. President believes tariffs can undo automation, while the Prime Minister thinks they can cool the planet. The simple truth is that all a tariff can do is hurt the economy, and the only way to make the damage to an economy worse is to use non-tariff trade barriers to free trade.

• (1720)

As I said at the start, the bill is another example of Liberals' failing to secure a trade deal. Thanks to Brexit, we had leverage over Britain. We had cards to play, yet we folded. The United Kingdom is keeping in place its non-tariff barriers on Canadian beef and pork. The U.K. claims our food safety system is unsafe. Japan, Australia, Malaysia, Mexico and all the other partners of the trans-Pacific partnership all agree Canadian food is safe. The U.K. is supposed to have agreed to respect our food safety system when it joined the partnership, yet two years on, here we are, ratifying U.K.'s entry, and the barriers remain in place.

What is the government's response? It promised that if the U.K. continues doing what it has always done, the government will write a stern letter and then launch a lengthy trade complaint process at the World Trade Organization. In the meantime, the U.K. producers will continue to sell millions of dollars' worth of beef and pork while our farmers wait and wait. The only relief these farmers will find is in knowing that they are not in the softwood lumber business; it is clear that this Brookfield government is treating our forestry industry as a card it hopes to play to save its EV subsidies in Ontario and Quebec.

The problem is that the government is playing go fish while the rest of the world is playing high-stakes poker. This might explain the shabby treatment shown to British retirees now living in Canada. Just as with our farmers, the government had leverage over our mother Parliament. The Prime Minister is burning up his carbon allowance, flying around the world looking for deals, the same way countless U.K. prime ministers have been doing since Brexit. We had a golden opportunity to support people living in Canada, but the Liberals could not be bothered to try.

For any Canadians unfamiliar with the issue, the U.K. has a public pension like ours. When British retirees move abroad, they continue to receive their pension. If they live in the rebellious colonies to the south, their U.K. pension is indexed to inflation. If they live in the loyal Dominion of Canada, they receive a fixed amount from the day they first applied. This issue directly affects 100,000 U.K. retirees who live in Canada, but indirectly it affects every Canadian.

Each month, 100,000 of our neighbours and friends get a little poorer. Each month, they have less to spend buying Canadian beef for supper. Each month, they have a little less to donate to the local church. Instead of having free time to volunteer at the food bank, they spend that time shopping at the food bank. This is not just hurting U.K. pensioners; it is discriminating against people living in Canada, and it is an insult.

The problem is that the former prime minister thought Canada was a nation of colonizing racist misogynists who deserve to be insulted. The new Prime Minister is an unabashed anglophile. As kids might say, he is a simp for Keir Starmer. Every country has its own shibboleths, the secret code words that allow fellow citizens to know if someone is one of us. As a bilingual country, it is not about how we pronounce it; it is about how we spell it.

In Canada we spell "catalyze" with a "z", but the Prime Minister spells it with an "s". He is less of a Manchurian candidate and more of a Manchester candidate. He is all too happy to sell out U.K. pensioners living in Canada and to sell out our beef and pork farmers if it means a chance at knighthood. The next time he gets together with his friends at Davos, they had better all address him as Sir Brookfield. I know that some people might find that ridiculous, but it is more comforting than reality.

The plain truth is that the Liberals are just incompetent with trade negotiations. It has been 10 years without a softwood lumber deal. There is the trade deal with the U.S. that the Prime Minister promised he would negotiate by mid-summer. There is also the time Trudeau almost blew up the trans-Pacific partnership so he could insert some feminist language into a meaningless annex. The fact that the bill before us is only at second reading is itself an example of Liberal incompetence on the trade file.

Canada needs free trade, but it finds itself in a trade war. We need a government that truly believes in trade. We need a Conservative government.

• (1725)

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that the supposition that Canada imposed a carbon tax on Ukraine from the Canadian press is demonstrably false. This was not imposed on Ukraine. Ukraine has had a carbon tax since 2011, and there was a clause that simply said it would cooperate.

Will the member retract her false statement?

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, Ukraine had a carbon tax, but it was too low for former prime minister Trudeau. Therefore, he imposed an additional tax so that it would be equal to ours. Ukraine already had one. He just made it worse.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague, who spoke at length about the government's mismanagement, especially when it comes to softwood lumber. However, there is a proposal that has been going around for some time that would give the forestry sector some much-needed relief. It would involve buying back up to 50% of the countervailing and anti-dumping duties at the end of each month. However, I have never heard a Conservative member speak to that.

I would like to know whether my colleague thinks that this is a good idea to help the forestry sector stay afloat until an agreement is signed.

[*English*]

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, we started campaigning to make sure the softwood lumber agreement would be in place. The Liberals have not even considered putting it in as part of the negotiations for the next USMCA.

The truth is that the government does not want a forestry industry. We see that in all the UN declarations, such as 30 by 30, which will become 50 by 50, with land set aside where nobody can harvest anything. It is time to face reality. The Liberals do not want trees cut down.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my long-time colleague and friend for her excellent speech here in the House and for telling Canadians exactly how it is here in Ottawa.

As a patriot, how much longer does she think Canada can hold out as a sovereign nation before it becomes a subsidiary of Brookfield?

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, for a minute, I thought he was going to ask me how much longer I was going to stay in Parliament.

We actually do not know that Canada is not a subsidiary. The government has already provided over a billion dollars a year to a consortium of companies to run CNL, our crown jewel in the nuclear laboratories. He is willing to sell that down without any Canadian participation. My concern, my fellow Conservative, is that he has already sold us.

• (1730)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member was factually incorrect on a number of accounts. Harper had nothing to do with the signing of the Canada-Ukraine deal. That was actually Justin Trudeau and the minister of foreign affairs at the time. On the European Union, the 27 countries, he had nothing to do with that either. A Liberal government actually signed off on them, not to mention the other countries that she mentioned.

The member has got to be somewhat nervous when the current leader of the Conservative Party is looking to run in a riding in Ontario. Rumour has it that the member opposite might be stepping aside. Can the member confirm to the House that she will be running in the next federal election in the same riding?

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I will tell my greatest fan that, yes, I will be back.

However, the Liberals rewrite history. First, they tear down history, the statues and everything, and then they rewrite it so that it favours their narrative. It is time we went back to what really happened and teach our children the genuine history of Canada.

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Cardigan.

I rise today in support of Bill C-13, legislation that confirms Canada's ratification of the United Kingdom's accession to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, or the CPTPP.

This legislation is part of Canada's ongoing story as one of the world's greatest trading nations. Like any great story, it is important to understand where we have been, where we are today and where we are going. Canada's history is inseparable from trade. Our prosperity has always come from looking outward, engaging with the world and building bridges that connect our people, our products and our ideas with global markets.

Over generations, we have built one of the most impressive records of trade leadership of any nation. Canada stands as the only G7 country that has free trade agreements with every other member of the G7. Think about what that says about who we are: a nation committed to openness, a nation trusted by its peers and a nation recognized for its reliability in global commerce. Our reach goes far beyond the G7. Canada has 15 free trade agreements with 51 countries, giving our businesses and workers preferential access to 1.5 billion consumers.

That extraordinary achievement is the result of decades of work by governments of all stripes, by diplomats, by negotiators and by Canadian businesses and their top-notch workers, who have built our reputation around the world. We are a nation that has embraced openness not as a risk but as a strength. We are a country that knows when Canadians compete on the global stage, we win.

Since this government was elected, we have relentlessly worked to expand that foundation even further, and we have results to show for it. Canada has signed a free trade agreement with Ecuador, a growing market with which our bilateral trade already exceeds \$1 billion annually, opening opportunities for Canadian agri-food exporters, clean-tech innovators and mining service providers. We have signed a comprehensive economic partnership agreement with Indonesia, a G20 member of 278 million people projected to be become the fifth-largest economy in the world, giving Canadian businesses preferential access to a booming consumer market.

We will be negotiating a trade agreement with the Philippines, an economy expanding 5% to 6% annually, where a young population is driving new demand for Canadian products. We are negotiating a trade agreement with the ASEAN bloc, a region of 680 million consumers with a GDP of \$3.7 trillion, where Canadian exporters stand to benefit in areas such as clean technology, agriculture and digital services.

Staying with ASEAN, we have also advanced bilateral free trade talks with Thailand because its fast-growing economy and rising ties with Canada make this agreement a key opportunity to boost Canadian jobs and open a major market for our businesses. We are advancing trade discussions with India, the world's fifth-largest economy, offering vast opportunities for Canadian companies in education, critical minerals, clean energy and advanced manufacturing.

We have signed a foreign investment promotion and protection agreement with the United Arab Emirates, one of Canada's largest trading partners in the Middle East. As well, we have announced negotiations for a broader trade agreement with the U.A.E. to deepen access to this powerful market.

At the G20, the Prime Minister announced the launch of discussions of an investment agreement with South Africa, the most industrial economy in Africa, strengthening the foundation for Canadian investment in a continent of 1.4 billion potential consumers. We are advancing negotiations on a digital trade agreement with the European Union, a \$17-trillion market, ensuring Canadian fintech, AI, cybersecurity and e-commerce firms can compete and grow globally. We have launched discussions on a trade agreement with the Mercosur bloc, which includes Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, a market of 295 million people with a combined GDP of \$2.7 trillion.

This is one of the most ambitious trade expansion agendas Canada has ever taken and reflects a simple truth: In a world where supply chains are shifting, where economies are transforming and where competition is intensifying, Canada must lead and never follow. Today we debate trade legislation, Bill C-13, but as seen from my speech, it will most certainly not be our last. There is much more to come.

• (1735)

We stand at a turning point in the evolution of one of the most important trade agreements on earth: the CPTPP trading bloc. The trading bloc consists of 11 countries, soon to be 12. The United Kingdom's accession to the CPTPP represents the agreement's first expansion. It brings into the fold the world's sixth-largest economy and a long-standing, deeply trusted ally. The U.K. is already one of Canada's most significant trading partners, our third-largest destination for merchandise exports and a top source for investments.

With the U.K. joining the CPTPP, Canadian exports will benefit from stronger, more predictable access in areas ranging from seafood to advanced manufacturing, clean technology, services and digital trade. This matters because the CPTPP is a high-standard, rules-based framework that shapes the future of trade in the Indo-Pacific, one of the fastest growing regions in the world. With the U.K. at the table, the CPTPP becomes stronger, more influential and more attractive for future accessions. It expands our reach and

Government Orders

it opens new doors for Canadian businesses at a moment when diversification is not optional; it is essential. Bill C-13 ensures that Canada is not only part of this moment, but that we are welcoming new partners to the table so that we can shape it together.

As we look forward to where we are going, this government has set a bold, ambitious and necessary goal to double Canada's non-U.S. exports to over \$300 billion within the next 10 years. Achieving that goal would mean more exports that support good jobs, drive innovation and strengthen communities across every region in our country.

To get there, we need to make sure our businesses have the tools they need to succeed. That is why, in budget 2025, we make major investments in Canada's supply chain infrastructure. Exporters can only grow if the roads, rails, ports and airports that they rely on are strong, resilient and efficient. With our new \$5-billion trade diversification infrastructure fund, we will be supporting more growth. To double our non-U.S. exports, we need 21st-century infrastructure capacity that matches our ambition. That is exactly what we plan to deliver. Canadians deserve no less.

We also need to support businesses, especially small and medium-sized enterprises, as they take their first steps into global markets and expand into new ones. That means improving programs, such as the CanExport program, that help companies export, strengthening the services that guide them and continuing to work with partners, provinces and territories, indigenous partners, industry associations, pension funds and financial institutions to create a seamless network of support. This is the path forward. This is how we get from where we are to where we are going.

Government Orders

Trade is about people. Let me tell the House who we do this work for. It is about the farmers in Saskatchewan who rise before dawn and work every day to feed families here in Canada and around the world. It is about the shipbuilder in Nova Scotia whose craftsmanship carries Canadian expertise across the Atlantic. It is about the miner in Nunavut supplying the critical minerals the world needs for clean-tech supply chains. It is about the energy in British Columbia, low-carbon energy, reaching new Asian markets and supporting thousands of jobs. It is about the aerospace engineer in Quebec designing components that fly in planes on every continent.

It is about the fisheries and the fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador who bring world-class seafood from cold Atlantic waters to global markets. It is about the Alberta energy workers whose expertise and commitment drive our energy sector forward. It is about the advanced manufacturers in Ontario producing parts for assembly lines in Asia and beyond. It is about the entrepreneurs in Manitoba whose agri-food innovations feed communities around the world. It is about the tourism operator in Prince Edward Island welcoming travellers who discover Canada through international agreements. It is about the tech founders in New Brunswick exporting cybersecurity solutions around the globe. It is about the clean-tech innovator in the Northwest Territories transforming northern engineering into global opportunities. As well, it is about the indigenous artists and cultural entrepreneurs in Yukon sharing creativity and our identity with the world.

Canada has achieved extraordinary things. We are not a country that rests. We are not a country that settles. We are relentless: relentless in our ambition, relentless in our pursuit of new opportunities and relentless in our determination to keep delivering for Canadians.

Bill C-13 and the U.K.'s accession to the CPTPP is part of that momentum. It is a continuation of a story that began generations ago and that will carry us forward for generations to come. Let us meet this moment with confidence. Let us meet this moment with optimism. Let us meet with a team Canada approach, united in the conviction that our ambition should be as vast as the opportunities before us and the country we collectively represent here in Parliament, because when Canadians set bold goals, when we work together and when we look outward to the world, there is nothing that we cannot achieve.

• (1740)

The Deputy Speaker: Before we proceed to questions and comments, I have consulted with the Table, and there was one small procedural error made. We were supposed to seek unanimous consent for the minister to be able to speak to the bill. There is a procedural reason for that.

This is going to sound odd, but I would ask if we could have unanimous consent for the minister to make a speech so we can complete questions and comments afterward. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. members. I wanted to make sure that I did not interrupt the minister's speech so he could complete it before we went to questions and comments.

The hon. member for Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies.

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I noted that the Minister of International Trade was talking about great things to come.

I want to take him to things as they are right now. We have trade agreements in place, but they are not being enforced. For example, chicken producers in my riding of Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies are asking why the government continues to allow the U.S. to send 115% of its spent fowl production to Canada. Part of that 115% is mislabeled, shipped to Canada, relabelled and then sold as broiler meat, which is in competition with Canadian producers.

Why is this allowed to happen?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his advocacy for farmers in his region. That is something that I am happy to follow up on with CFIA and Health Canada.

Speaking of the agriculture sector, the agreements I have spoken about will unlock new opportunities in markets around the world. We look at the CPTPP trading block, which consists of over 500 million potential consumers. When I am sitting down and talking to those in the agriculture sector, they are excited about the potential that these opportunities create. That is exactly what the government will do. We will continue to be out there opening doors for our farmers and our workers.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset a few weeks ago, the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this bill even though it will oppose investor-state dispute settlement during clause-by-clause consideration, since we have always been against that. My question will not be on the substance of the agreement, which is good for everyone.

My colleague and I once served together on the Standing Committee on International Trade. He knows how long it takes to conduct in-depth studies on agreements that are sometimes very lengthy. In this case, the government did not abide by Canada's official policy on tabling treaties in Parliament, which is available on the website. There is supposed to be a 21-day period between the announcement of an agreement and the tabling of the legislation. In this case, it was 15 days.

Why did the government not follow its own official policy?

• (1745)

[*English*]

Hon. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, I hope to answer my colleague one day in French, as I am learning. I do miss my time on the trade committee with the member opposite.

Government Orders

We are in a crisis today, and the Prime Minister has been very clear about this. This is not a speed bump. This is a rupture in the current trading environment.

I spent 13 years in international trade prior to politics, facilitating trade for hundreds of businesses. If I were asked back then, I would have said that businesses were not ready to look at global markets because of the conditions that existed at that time with the U.S. Twenty-five years ago, 90% of our trade was with the U.S. It is now around 75%, and we have to move fast. That is exactly what the government is doing.

We are moving quickly because we want to make sure that these trade agreements are in place. This is what stakeholders are asking us to do. This is what Canadians are asking us to do. As we sort this out and have those discussions with the U.S., we need to continue opening new markets.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify for the member for Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies that it was actually this government that established an MOU between CFIA and CBSA to tackle spent fowl. The minister may or may not know that, but that is work that we are doing. I will remind the Conservative Party that it had nothing in its electoral platform for farmers.

Speaking of farmers, I have a large apple contingent in the Annapolis Valley. The Nova Scotia fruit growers have a tradition of over one hundred years of growing quality Honeycrisp apples. One of their growth markets is in Vietnam.

I am wondering if the Minister of International Trade would talk about the work he is doing in the Indo-Pacific, what the government is doing to help create export markets, and maybe, explicitly, whether he and I could work together with those Nova Scotia fruit growers to create more markets in Vietnam and beyond in the Indo-Pacific.

Hon. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to thank the member for his incredible work on the trade file and for representing his constituents so well.

We have been talking about our farmers, and I was in different regions across the country, talking to farmers who grow fruits. Of course, the member mentioned Vietnam. It has been a huge market since we signed the CPTPP back a few years ago, in 2018. When we look at what we are doing with Vietnam and the trade numbers, there are incredible opportunities there and we are investing.

There is now an agri-food office in Manila in the Philippines to help facilitate even more trade for our farmers, for those who are involved in agriculture and agri-food. There are plenty of opportunities. That is exactly what we are exploring, as I mentioned, with many of the agreements we have talked about today.

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a bit of a heavy heart. I want to take a moment to acknowledge the passing of Cardigan fire chief Tony VandenBroek.

Tony is gone way too soon. Chief Tony was a dedicated leader and committed volunteer in his community. His decades of service reflect his courage, compassion and unwavering commitment to keeping others safe.

I also want to express my appreciation for the important discussions I had with representatives of the Canadian Volunteer Fire Services Association this week in Ottawa. Its support is crucial to supporting firefighters, such as Tony, who protect our communities.

I say to Chief VandenBroek's family, his fellow firefighters and everyone else who is feeling the loss, my thoughts are with them. May Tony rest in peace.

I rise today with pride to speak about the importance of international trade to the people of Prince Edward Island. Ambition, creativity and determination span this province from tip to tip. This is something that may be a bit of a challenge for me because I came from the supply-managed sectors, and all the trade deals, although they bring common good to the country, have carved away some of my industry, but I support free trade. That is why I am standing here today to speak to it.

Islanders know the value of hard work. It is their love of the land and the sea that lays that foundation. Whether it is running tractors through the fields in eastern P.E.I., hauling traps in Morell or serving customers at the local shops in Georgetown, farmers, fishers and manufacturers are producing traditional world-class commodities with care and ingenuity. They are not just feeding families on the island; they are also feeding Canada and the world. They are not just crafting goods; they are creating excellence that stretches far beyond our red shores to all corners of the globe.

Islanders understand that trade is not an abstract policy. It is more than just numbers on a spreadsheet or lines on a ledger. Trade is about people. It is about the hands that haul the lobster traps, the families who farm the potato fields and the innovators who turn local knowledge and creativity into a global opportunity. In today's fast-changing global economy, for Islanders to be competitive and to succeed, P.E.I. businesses need further access and expansion across the global industry.

Trade diversification is not just a government policy priority, but a necessity for economic sustainability. Too often smaller economies, like ours in Atlantic Canada, become vulnerable when we rely too heavily on one or two export destinations. We have seen, time and again, how a single border delay, a newly imposed tariff or an unexpected policy shift can ripple across an entire province and significantly impact an entire industry.

Government Orders

That is why agreements like the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, or CPTPP, and Canada's vast network of trade agreements are so vital for Prince Edward Island's future. The CPTPP opens doors to fast-growing markets across the Asia-Pacific region in countries such as New Zealand, Vietnam, Malaysia, and now, with this legislation, the United Kingdom. It provides clarity in trade rules, lowers tariffs and offers fair access for our exporters. It gives our potato growers, seafood processors, bioscience innovators and small business producers the pathways and tools to reach new customers.

Islanders are proud of what we make and produce. We farm responsibly. We fish sustainably. We innovate with excellence. The world is noticing. There is a growing demand for P.E.I. seafood, our world-famous potatoes, our bioscience, technology and research, and the creativity of our local artists, storytellers and musicians who perform for audiences from all over the world.

However, global demand alone is not enough. We need agreements that open doors and the infrastructure and policies to help Islanders walk through them. That is where our Prime Minister's announcement comes in. It is a bold, transformative goal to double Canada's non-U.S. exports over the next decade. Doubling our non-U.S. exports means diversifying where we sell, what we sell and how we sell it. This means a pathway to resilience, growth and independence, and with agreements, such as with the U.K. accession, being strengthened, we would have the tools to make that vision a reality.

● (1750)

For decades, our island economy, like much of Canada's economy, has relied heavily on a single market. That partnership with our friends and neighbours to the south will always remain important to us, but if we want to secure our long-term prosperity and independence, we must broaden our reach. It means finding new customers for island seafood on other islands around the world, like Japan or Singapore. It means showcasing our clean tech and bioscience innovations in the U.K. and Australia. It means putting P.E.I. products on tables and in markets around the world. The CPTPP is one of the key tools that would help us achieve that goal.

When we talk about doubling the exports, we are talking about creating new markets for our producers, reducing risk and building resilience. That is what this legislation is about. It is about building the future of communities on Prince Edward Island.

Why does this matter so much to P.E.I.? It matters because P.E.I. is an export province. Over 90% of what we produce, we export. Our success depends on our ability to move products beyond our shores, whether it is by truck across the Confederation Bridge, by plane, by ship across the Atlantic Ocean or even by digital connection. By connecting our producers to new global customers, we would be taking concrete steps toward doubling our non-U.S. exports, strengthening both local jobs and Canada's presence on the world stage. When island seafood, farm crops or manufactured goods find buyers in Europe or Asia, that success flows back home. It means more young people choosing to stay to build their futures on P.E.I. and in Atlantic Canada.

Trade diversification is also about resilience. Through building relationships with multiple partners, we provide businesses with

options and workers with stability. This is how we protect the prosperity that generations of Islanders have worked so hard to build and maintain. The CPTPP, especially with the inclusion of the United Kingdom, reinforces the kind of trade values Canada believes in, which are fair, inclusive and sustainable trade.

These values are also important to Islanders. It is trade that upholds high standards for labour, strong environmental protections and clear digital commerce rules, all areas where Canada and our province of P.E.I. can lead. Our exporters do not want to compete by lowering standards. They want to compete by raising them, by offering better quality, better sustainability and better reliability.

Now, what would this mean in practice for P.E.I.? It would mean new market opportunities for our seafood industry. It would mean a stronger platform for our agri-food producers, from potato growers to the entrepreneurs turning local ingredients into global products. It would mean momentum for our bioscience cluster, one of the fastest-growing sectors in Atlantic Canada, where firms are developing health solutions that are already reaching overseas markets. It would also mean a brighter future for our tourism and cultural industries because trade is not only about goods; it is also about ideas, creativity and people-to-people connections.

● (1755)

When the Prime Minister set the goal to double Canada's non-U.S. exports, the Prime Minister sent a clear signal that every province and territory has a role to play. We all need to step up our game, and I know we can. For Prince Edward Island, this is an opportunity to show what our island can achieve with big ambition. Now with the CPTPP and the inclusion of the U.K., we would have another framework and the improved access it needs to grow. This is how we will reach that goal, by combining national leadership with local initiative and global ambition with island pride.

This bill is about nation building through new partnership opportunities. By ratifying the United Kingdom's accession to the CPTPP, we would help ensure that Islanders can continue to make a substantial impact on the world stage. We would strengthen our ability to export sustainable and high-quality products, exactly what we do best. We would ensure that the next generation of Islanders inherits a strong economy, one that continues the legacy of quality products.

Let us support this legislation for the benefit of our national economy and for every Islander whose work, creativity and resilience deserves to be a strong player on the world stage. When P.E.I. succeeds, Canada succeeds and when Canada trades with the world, our communities become stronger.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

CONSERVATION DONATIONS

Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.) moved:

That:

- (a) the House recognize that,
- (i) the Government of Canada has committed to conserving 30% of territory by 2030 in order to address biodiversity loss and strengthen the resilience of our ecosystems,
 - (ii) in the Eastern Townships, approximately 91% of the territory consists of private land, 63% is covered by forests, wetlands and waterways, and more than 130 endangered species have been identified,
 - (iii) the voluntary conservation of private land is a key lever for achieving this national objective,
 - (iv) the Ecological Gifts Program (EGP) has enabled many landowners to contribute to the protection of invaluable natural environments,
 - (v) recognized conservation organizations must finance their day-to-day operations and long-term stewardship costs that are generally not eligible for government programs (e.g., due diligence, legal and transaction costs, monitoring, restoration, reports, governance),
 - (vi) the increase in the number of projects multiplies these operating costs and creates a structural funding deficit, making philanthropic monetary donations essential to maintain and accelerate the pace of conservation,
 - (vii) tax parity between in-kind donations (land, easements) and monetary donations to recognized conservation organizations would ensure fairness among donors, secure operational funding, and stimulate large-scale protection of natural environments; and
- (b) in the opinion of the House, the government should,
- (i) recognize the importance of increasing the federal tax credit granted to financial landlords who make an ecological donation through the EGP,
 - (ii) recognize the importance of granting a tax credit equivalent to the monetary donations made to recognized conservation organizations to support the operating and stewardship costs of protected land,
 - (iii) consider amending the Income Tax Act to ensure tax fairness among the different types of conservation donations, with a view to reaching the biodiversity protection targets the government has already set.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to move Motion No. 15, a motion that is deeply rooted in our land, our forests, our mountains, our rivers and our communities. It is based on a commitment we all share, that of protecting nature, not in theory, but on the ground through meaningful and sustainable actions.

Private Members' Business

Protecting the environment is the reason I got into politics. Before coming here, I volunteered at Protégeons Bromont and worked as a municipal councillor. I then had the privilege of serving as the mayor of Bromont for eight years. I say this with great humility: It is by working together with citizens, conservation organizations, elected officials at all levels of government and landowners that we were able to take decisive action to preserve our natural heritage.

During my term, we carried out a major conservation project to protect the southern face of Mont Brome in Bromont. This ecologically valuable area is an essential link in the network of natural environments surrounding the city. Thanks to this project, we were able to preserve more than 17 hectares of woodlands, forested slopes and exceptional landscapes, while maintaining a balance between municipal development, recreational offerings and conservation.

We also contributed to a second major project: the protection of Mont Gale, one of Bromont's most iconic areas. It still sends a shiver down my spine when I think of how this area was once slated for residential development, but thanks to grassroots campaigning, the involvement of local communities, municipal leadership, and the vital work of conservation organizations, particularly Appalachian Corridor, the Société de conservation du mont Brome and the Nature Conservancy of Canada, it is now protected in perpetuity for the enjoyment of future generations. These partners played a critical role not only in preserving these lands, but also in integrating them into a sustainable vision of land use planning where conservation, responsible access, and ecosystem health are all taken into consideration.

The protected area today features scenic lookouts and a network of trails where families, hikers and outdoor enthusiasts can enjoy nature safely. With its lake, its forests and its peak, Mont Gale is an exceptional natural area. The conservation network that surrounds it ensures the protection of a diversified habitat for flora and fauna.

These achievements speak to a deep conviction that safeguarding nature is a long-term investment, not a barrier to development. It demonstrates that it is perfectly possible for quality of life, recreation and tourism, and respect for the environment to coexist. It takes vision, now and for the long term.

If I may, I would like to step back in time, to 1876, to be exact. In that era, no one had ever heard of climate change. In 1876, the City of Montreal commissioned Frederick Olmsted, one of the two architects who designed Central Park, to work on a design for Mount Royal Park, which features 423 hectares of natural areas protected in perpetuity. Who today would even think of destroying this natural environment?

When I talk about protecting natural environments, it is not a matter of ideology. It is a matter of taking responsibility and action. By defending these projects, we have taken concrete steps towards preserving the natural heritage of our region.

Private Members' Business

It is with these same values in mind that I am moving Motion No. 15 today to give citizens, landowners and conservation organizations the fiscal tools they need to protect even more territory before it is lost forever. Let us think of future generations. What do we want to leave to them?

Canada has committed to conserving 30% of its territory by 2030. However, one fact remains. In many regions, such as the Eastern Townships, more than 90% of the territory consists of private land. Without the voluntary participation of landowners, we will never reach our national conservation goals.

● (1805)

This is why ecological gifts play such an essential role. Since 1995, more than 220,000 hectares across the country have been protected through the ecological gifts program. However, the reality is that conservation organizations have ongoing responsibilities, including monitoring sites, restoring habitats, responding to ecological threats and ensuring long-term management. The truth is that they rarely have adequate funding to carry out these tasks.

Additionally, the current tax incentives for monetary donations, which support these responsibilities, are insufficient to encourage the environmental philanthropy we need to achieve our conservation targets. Motion No. 15 proposes that the government modernize its tax tools by enhancing incentives for ecological donations, creating a tax credit equivalent to the monetary donations made to conservation organizations and ensuring tax fairness among the different types of donations. In other words, it is about updating a 30-year-old tax framework to meet present-day needs and help us achieve our goals.

Protecting nature is not a cost; it is an investment. Wetlands prevent flooding, forests filter our water and healthy soils reduce heat islands. The latest analyses show that every dollar invested in nature yields up to \$20 in benefits for the community.

I will give a few concrete examples from our region. In Lac-Brome and Sutton, two recent ecological donations have helped protect nearly 20 hectares located in the Montagnes-Vertes ecological corridor, a cross-border corridor that is critical to the survival of many species. Another example is the Brière forest between Sutton and Potton. This 540-hectare area was to be subdivided for housing development. An ecologically valuable forest the size of 1,000 football fields could have been turned into a housing development. The housing that would have been built in this bucolic environment would not have been affordable housing. It was a development that would have brought in \$7.4 million in revenue. However, the owner, Guy Brière, chose to make an ecological donation. This visionary gift protected more than 250 species of plants, 53 species of birds, critical habitats for black bears and bobcats, and part of a water source used by thousands of people.

These examples are not just anecdotes. They are proof that Canadians take extraordinary action when they are given the right tools. However, the fact is that conservation projects are costly. Before the land is even acquired, biologists, surveyors, appraisers, notaries and lawyers must be hired and paid. Then there is ongoing work to be done in perpetuity. Monetary donations are essential to financing this work, but the current incentives are insufficient.

However, we can draw inspiration from a model that has proven successful in Quebec, namely, the additional tax credit for a first major cultural donation. This measure has increased cultural philanthropy by nearly 30%. Why not offer a similar tool to support conservation organizations? Some will say that these measures benefit the wealthiest. That is not the case. The majority of donations come from families who have been established in our region for generations. They are woodlot owners, people who voluntarily give up part of their inheritance for the common good and who are often much richer in land than in money. The cost to the government is relatively modest, \$25 million to \$35 million per year, according to official data. The return, however, is immense.

Motion No. 15 is not partisan. It is part of Canada's 2030 nature strategy, our commitment to 30x30, and the global biodiversity framework for 2020-30. It reflects our best qualities: generosity, cooperation and shared responsibility.

By protecting nature, we protect ourselves. We protect the water we drink, the air we breathe and the landscapes that define us. I therefore invite all my colleagues from all parties to support Motion No. 15 in order to encourage generosity toward nature and strengthen the tools we need to preserve our natural heritage.

● (1810)

[*English*]

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting. We have the opportunity, with slots for private members' bills, to put forward a bill or a motion. The member has chosen to put forward a motion, not a bill, and the motion is asking the government to consider amending the Income Tax Act.

I just want to ask the member, if he has specific recommendations with respect to a program, why he did not just put forward legislation to make the change he wants. Does he think it is maybe a bit lacking in ambition to put forward a motion to ask the government to consider doing something, when he has the power, as a member of Parliament, to actually put forward legislation to do that thing he is asking the government to consider?

[*Translation*]

Louis Villeneuve: Mr. Speaker, I chose to move a motion because, as a private member, I cannot introduce a bill requiring the expenditure of funds. I therefore chose to move a motion.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my hon. colleague on his initiative, which we will support. I also want to congratulate the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie for acting on conviction over the past few days. He stood his ground, showed courage, and decided to resign from cabinet because of the marked retreat from, not to say abandonment of, the fight against climate change. The hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie even said that it would be dishonest to say that Canada will meet its 2030 climate targets.

Private Members' Business

Knowing that climate change is the greatest threat to biodiversity, I would like to know if his hon. colleagues will also stand up and denounce the government's dangerous backpedalling.

Louis Villeneuve: Mr. Speaker, personally, I am doing what I need to do, as the representative for my riding and as a Liberal member, to advance the environmental cause.

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during COP15 in Montreal, the parties adopted the global target of protecting 30% of their territory by 2030. How would this motion help achieve that goal?

Louis Villeneuve: Mr. Speaker, the target of protecting 30% of our territory by 2030, which was adopted in Montreal at COP15, requires us to mobilize every resource at our disposal. In Canada, one critical tool that is too often underestimated is the voluntary conservation of private lands.

In many areas of the country, including my own, the Eastern Townships, over 90% of the land is private. This means that we will simply not be able to meet the 30% target without encouraging more landowners to protect their land and without providing better support for the conservation organizations that help them.

[*English*]

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, respectfully, I have a follow-up to my previous question.

What the member said about the rules of the House is not correct. Members are able to propose private members' bills that spend money; they simply need a royal recommendation, which is the support of cabinet, in order to proceed. The member could have proposed legislation to do this. It might have required a royal recommendation, although, in this case, the concept the member is talking about is not a new expenditure but a change in tax treatment. I do not think that a reduction of taxes without new expenditures even requires a royal recommendation anyway.

First of all, the member could have put forward the motion either way if he had the government's support. Secondly, I do not think this even needs a royal recommendation. The fact is, doing it this way, asking the government to think about something, looks like a desire to send a signal of sympathy without actually making a change. I wonder, if the member had the courage of his convictions, why he did not actually propose the change that he wants to put forward.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Louis Villeneuve: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the politics lesson. What I need to know is whether he supports the substance of the motion. The idea here is to advance the environmental cause and not spend our time arguing about things that, in my opinion, are not important.

[*English*]

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about Motion M-15. It is not a private member's bill. It is not a pathway to anything specific in terms of legislation or regulation or policy. It is basically a suggestion from the colleague across the aisle.

Before I start my comments, I would like to acknowledge something that happened in the House not more than an hour ago. Bill C-225, Bailey's law, was passed, and Bailey's family was here to witness it. It was a lot of hard work from a lot of our colleagues on this side of the aisle in the Conservative caucus, led by the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. It drained a lot of emotion out of a lot of members on this side of the House, so I really commend and thank all those people and parties that made it happen. It was historic. After 10 years, I think we can see light at the end of the tunnel for the victims and maybe put some real teeth back into our justice system.

Motion M-15 brings me back. It is amazing how much the activities in the House bring me back to my earlier days. I was part of the Haisla Nation Council, which participated in a lot of conservation measures, not knowing that it was somehow attached to a global entity that was proposing an initiative like 30 by 30, which is the idea that we should conserve 30% of the land base by 2030. This is not a made-in-Canada initiative.

When I was chief councillor of Haisla Nation, a small little native band, we did not take our direction from external entities. We did it based on what we needed, what we wanted and what we wanted to achieve. We never took anybody's lead. I often wonder why Canada does this. Why does it look to the World Economic Forum or the United Nations for direction? Members are elected for a reason. We should know what the country needs and what direction we should be going towards. Why do we need direction from somebody else? We are all capable people here, and I hope we are all capable leaders. If anything, we should be thinking about initiatives by Canadians for Canadians.

It took me a while to figure this out as a councillor and then as chief councillor for Haisla Nation Council, but we had the same objectives in mind: We wanted to conserve sensitive areas in our territory. I was a part of an organization called Turning Points, which changed its name to Coastal First Nations. There is confusion in the media about what the term "coastal first nations" means. Coastal First Nations is an official, non-profit organization. I think people get it confused with the first nations that live on the coast, which is a different term altogether.

Private Members' Business

I did not know at the time that taking funds from American funders to conserve land was an issue. In fact, the funds we received at that time were funnelled through the David Suzuki Foundation. By the time I left and took my band out of that organization, the talk was to eliminate the David Suzuki Foundation as a funnel for the funds coming from American funders. We left because we had a difference of opinion in terms of comments we were told about that had been made toward the LNG industry.

I agree with the concept of protecting ecologically sensitive areas. I read what Prime Minister Harper did at the time, but he did not commit to 30 by 30; he committed to protecting 70% of the land base. That is a good thing now, given what is happening today. It was timely, because we do want to protect ecologically sensitive areas. In fact, we already do, through a number of different measures.

I do not understand why we need this. We protect ecologically sensitive areas within environmental assessments, for example. Not only that, but we actually repair ecologically sensitive areas within the environmental assessment through the environmental offsets initiative. Canada is already doing a good job at protecting ecologically sensitive areas. I do not see why we need a foreign body or an international body to dictate what we should or should not with our land base.

• (1820)

It is timely to have this discussion now because we have not really figured out what the Cowichan court case means in terms of private land. I think we are putting the cart ahead of the horse until we figure out exactly what that means. The federal government may intend to argue on behalf of private landowners, and the B.C. government may intend to do likewise, but it is unclear what the argument is going to be. Until we figure that out, we should think carefully about this, because we might have to undo this and we might have even more chaos in terms of what we are seeing right now in Richmond, B.C.

The other thing, in terms of timing, is that everybody acknowledges that we are in a housing crisis, but this motion is proposing to take even more private land out of the land base and sterilize that land, so we cannot build more houses. It is not the time to talk about private land being taken out of the land base, out of municipalities or regional districts for that matter. We are going to need land if Canada ever decides to live up to its promise of building 500,000 houses per year. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has already pointed out that the Liberals are not going to reach that target, ever. At best, they will do 5,000 houses.

This brings me back to my days in the B.C. legislature, where we thought that the B.C. NDP promise of building 114,000 houses in 10 years was unachievable. It was; it was proven. A Tye article said that a lot of the houses that they reported were policy-created. There were no new houses built.

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I appreciate that hon. colleagues have the ability to try to weave in a lot of different elements, but this is in relation to the particular motion that is before the House. I hope that you can provide guidance to my hon. colleague to try to keep reasonably within the

bounds. I know there is a lot of latitude, but it is starting to feel a bit far away from the motion at hand. That is just what I have observed from this side of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister for the reminder. I am sure the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley was returning to the matter at hand, so I invite him to continue speaking with that in mind.

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I thought private land was the discussion, and to the best of my recollection, most of the houses being built in Canada are built on private land. If we are going to talk about private land, we also have to talk about the plan to take private land out of the land base. I think it is totally directed. In fact, of all the promises we are talking about here, I think housing should be addressed if we are talking about taking private land out of the land base. I think it is totally related.

As a first nation, when we were trying to conserve land, all these promises were made by telling us that if we conserved land, a whole different economy was going to be brought to us. There would be tourism. Everybody would get a job. Everybody was going to have a house of their own. First nations would be well off. Kitlope was protected in the same manner as we are talking about here. Who got wealthy and benefited under that? The environmental organizations did. Their offices got bigger. They hired more staff. They had offices in San Francisco and Vancouver. I visited them. One in particular had 150 staff members.

What did my band get? For all the work that we did to preserve land, we got nothing. All we got was a \$30,000-a-year funding option from the B.C. government. That was all we got. It was not even enough to hire anybody. It was good enough for administrative purposes, but that was it. I think the timing of this motion is not right, considering all the different pressures Canadians are facing, as well as the housing crisis and many other issues, but I am running out of time, so I will sit down.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, the Bloc Québécois supports Motion No. 15. This motion concerns ecological gifts. Among other things, it proposes that the House recognize certain principles regarding the importance of conserving private land to protect biodiversity, and that the government consider tax measures to promote this type of conservation.

Private Members' Business

The public issue that we are discussing is the preservation of biodiversity, which actually refers to the variety that exists among living organisms, including genetic, species and ecosystem diversity. One thing the motion proposes is that the House recognize the importance of voluntary conservation, which is the conservation by property owners of ecological features found on their land. These may include waterways, marshes, buffer strips, wetlands, habitats, vulnerable species and endangered species.

It must be noted that the federal government does not have jurisdiction over land that it does not own. It is important to keep that in mind. Supporting private conservation initiatives is a valuable tool that the federal government can use to promote land-based conservation, and the Bloc Québécois supports that.

The Bloc Québécois would also like to point out that, currently, conservation organizations play a key role on the ground. These are stakeholders who often work on a voluntary basis and are involved in the conservation of private lands, particularly in Quebec. Members should keep in mind that we are talking about 8% of our land that is private, primarily in southern Quebec. These areas have some of the richest and most diverse natural environments. The southern regions have unique ecosystems, but they also have some of the most significant interactions between people and nature.

By supporting Motion No. 15, we wish to renew our commitment in favour of legal conservation measures, like tax breaks, because we should work toward encouraging donations of land to conservation organizations so they are able to protect more land. In southern Quebec in particular, it is important to do this and to protect this land in perpetuity. This would result in significant benefits for the ecosystems in question, as well as for the people who get to enjoy these ecosystems.

Another avenue to consider, and the one we feel is the most important, is for the federal government to plan to take concrete action to protect nature, particularly by enhancing the nature agreements between the provinces and the federal government. That is one of the reasons why the Bloc Québécois proposed, during the 2025 election campaign, that the federal government triple its share of the funding for the Canada-Quebec nature agreement, increasing it from \$100 million to at least \$300 million, in order to help Quebec, which is taking action to protect nature.

Unfortunately, what we see in the latest budget is that the protection of nature has been completely left out, even though it is a recurring theme with this government. There were zero additional dollars in the latest budget for the protection of nature, for the protection of biodiversity, even though the government has committed to reaching some fairly ambitious targets by 2030.

Action is in fact urgently needed. In our view, the government has to show some consistency here, because humans are dependent on biodiversity in many respects. We depend on what it does for us, whether that is in terms of food, medications, air quality improvement, water quality improvement, or mitigation of the effects of climate change, such as droughts and floods.

The loss of biodiversity is one of the most urgent global emergencies, along with pollution, climate change and others. Even the World Economic Forum has identified biodiversity protection or

biodiversity loss as the third most pressing global risk along with disinformation and misinformation, the return of state-based armed conflict and the climate change crisis.

● (1830)

The loss of biodiversity is a crisis. Additional measures need to be taken to protect biodiversity from threats posed by habitat and ecosystem loss and degradation resulting from human activity. This is why it is so important to protect private lands and encourage protection by individuals and organizations. Obviously, urban sprawl and industrial overdevelopment come at a cost. The problem extends across the globe.

That is why the Convention on Biological Diversity, a global convention, was put in place in 1992. It eventually led to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, ratified in Montreal in 2022, which set ambitious targets and was signed by the Canadian government. The most ambitious of the 23 targets is to protect 30% of Canada's land, inland waters and coastal and marine areas by 2030. This means protecting 30% of our territory by 2030. That is Canada's goal.

The Canadian government needs to get to work, because Canada set a target of protecting 25% of its territory by 2025. This target will obviously not be met. The previous government used to say that the goal of protecting 25% of Canada's land and waters would be met by 2025, but the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development was very clear in his latest report: As with the fight against climate change, Canada is not on track to achieve its area-based conservation targets, and there is currently no plan, road map or pathway for reaching its target of protecting 30% of its territory by 2030.

It is now 2025, and it is obvious that the Liberal government has missed its target. Today's figures show that 13.8% of Canada's terrestrial area, including land and freshwater, is protected and 15.5% of its marine territory is protected. This is a far cry from the 25% and 30% targets that would need to be met to halt and reverse biodiversity loss and to respect Canada's international biodiversity protection commitments. When we look at Canada's 2030 nature strategy, we realize how fortunate it is that Quebec itself made commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity. It is not waiting for the rest of Canada to develop and implement strategies, because Canada is still way behind.

Private Members' Business

It is important to understand that Quebec territory does not belong to the federal government, but to Quebecers. Quebec assumes its own responsibilities for protecting its territory and protecting the natural environment. The environment is protected by Quebec's environmental legislation, not the federal government. Quebec is a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity and managed to protect 17% of its territory by 2024. By way of comparison, Ontario has protected 10.9%. Quebec is doing its part and contributing to the goal of protecting 30% of the territory. Once again, Quebec has invested nearly \$908 million in its nature plan, while the federal government has contributed only \$100 million.

We need to look at the big picture, and what we see now are other significant rollbacks from the federal government that would more than cancel out its initiatives, including the initiative in Motion No. 15, which is important and which we support, as I said. How can Canada hope to meet its targets when what we are seeing now is a rollback of environmental protections? Areas are being opened up to more oil and gas development, regardless of the consequences. There are plans for new pipelines that would have serious repercussions. There is even talk of lifting the west coast oil tanker ban that has been in place since 1972, which would allow oil tankers to enter this ecologically valuable territory.

We want to move forward and see more measures like this being proposed. The government needs to enshrine this into law, if possible, to facilitate ecological donations. However, we cannot ignore the elephant in the room. It is the government's failure to protect biodiversity. It is the lack of a plan. It is the zero dollars in the latest budget for the protection of territory, biodiversity and parks. On the contrary, we are seeing rollbacks, while the Liberals have billions of dollars set aside for oil companies.

True, today's motion is a good initiative, but let us not forget that this government has a disastrous record when it comes to the environment, as stated by the former minister of Canadian identity and culture, the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

* * *

• (1835)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS NOS. 461 AND 470

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the point of order brought forward earlier by the member for Tobique—Mactaquac. I wish to confirm to the House that when Order Paper Questions Nos. 461 and 470 were signed by the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, the member was a minister.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the parliamentary secretary for that clarification. I did consult with the Table in anticipation that the parliamentary secretary may raise this matter. When the parliamentary secretary tabled the Order Paper questions, he took it upon himself on behalf of the ministry, so those answers were considered accurate when they were presented to the House. Therefore, the matter is considered closed. It will not be referred to committee. That matter is closed.

CONSERVATION DONATIONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak about Canada's ecological gifts program and provide information that may help members in their debate on Motion No. 15.

Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered on the unceded traditional territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin nation. I would also like to recognize that the lands and waters across Canada are the homelands and traditional territories of first nations, Inuit and Métis people.

I know first-hand that indigenous peoples have cared for these environments for thousands of years, and their knowledge and leadership remain essential today to conservation efforts. I remember growing up on the mouth of the Fraser River, which was my backyard and my playground, playing in the waters and fishing for salmon. I continue to do that today, but not in the way that my ancestors have done for thousands and thousands of years.

Over the years, as we welcomed many, many people to our shores, we did realize that all Canadians care deeply about nature. We depend on healthy ecosystems for clean air, clean water, stable climates, food stability and countless cultural and recreational benefits.

However, nature is coming under increased pressure. Climate change, habitat loss, pollution and landscape fragmentation are driving a decline in biodiversity in Canada and around the world. This reality highlights the need for urgent, coordinated action to stop and reverse nature loss.

The ecological gifts program is one of the tools that help Canada work toward that goal. It supports the voluntary long-term conservation of ecologically sensitive private land, complementing conservation efforts by federal, provincial, territorial, indigenous and community partners.

The program also allows Canadians who own ecologically sensitive lands to donate all or part of those lands to an eligible recipient. Eligible recipients include federal, provincial and territorial governments, municipalities, and environmental charities approved by Environment and Climate Change Canada. Once a donation is made, the recipient becomes responsible for protecting the biodiversity and environmental values of those lands. This helps ensure that important ecosystems remain intact for future generations.

Private Members' Business

The program is delivered by Environment and Climate Change Canada and supports many partners. This collaborative approach has contributed to the program's steady growth since it was created. Over the past 30 years, more than 2,000 ecological gifts have been made in this country. Together, they account for more than 261,000 hectares of habitat, an area larger than Prince Edward Island, and have an estimated total value of more than \$1.4 billion.

The donated lands must be certified as ecologically sensitive by the Minister of Environment. Many of these lands help protect species at risk, wetlands, grasslands, coastal areas, forests and other ecosystems that are disappearing or under threat. These donations reflect a wide range of motivations and local circumstances. Some landowners are individuals with a strong conservation ethic. Others are farmers, ranchers or corporate owners who want to safeguard the natural value of their land over the long term.

Although most donors participate because of their commitment to conservation, the Income Tax Act provides specific incentives to encourage donations of ecologically sensitive land. These incentives help reduce financial barriers and support landowner participation. Key tax features of the program include the following. Corporate donors may deduct the full amount of their gift from their taxable income. Individual donors receive a non-refundable tax credit for the eligible amount of the donation. The capital gain on an ecological gift is reduced to zero, which is significant because for most other charitable gifts, 50% of the capital gain is taxable. Donors may carry forward any unused portion of their donation for up to 10 years. There is no limit on how much ecological gift value can be claimed in a year.

A reduction in federal tax payable will also reduce provincial tax. When federal assistance and provincial assistance are combined, the overall rate of tax support for ecological gifts can be substantial, often as high as 80%, depending on the province. This level of support reflects the public benefits that come from conserving ecologically sensitive land.

The law sets clear criteria for who may receive ecological gifts. Eligible recipients include provincial, federal and territorial governments, municipalities, municipal or public bodies performing a function of government, and environmental charities that have been approved by Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Municipalities and charities must also be approved on a gift-by-gift basis to ensure that they have the capacity to protect the land's ecological value over the long term. If they wish later to dispose of the land or change its use, they must obtain written authorization from the Minister of Environment. Unauthorized dispositions or changes in use trigger a tax penalty equal to 50% of the property's fair market value at the time of the disposition or change in use.

• (1840)

Since its creation in 1995, the ecological gifts program has been strengthened many times to improve clarity, fairness and conservation outcomes. When the program began, ecological gifts were exempted from the usual income limit rules, and strict safeguards were introduced so that donated lands could not be sold or used differently without federal approval.

In 1997, Parliament improved how partial interests, such as conservation covenants, easements and servitudes, are valued so as to accurately reflect the amount of the donation. Further refinements followed in 2000. These included a reduced capital gains inclusion rate and a requirement that the Minister of Environment determine the fair market value of each gift, with donors given the right to appeal. In 2006, ecological gifts became fully exempt from capital gains tax, and in 2014, the carry-forward period for claiming donations was extended from five to 10 years. In 2017, donations of personal servitudes in Quebec of at least 100 years became eligible as ecological gifts. These updates reflect Parliament's long-standing commitment to protecting ecologically sensitive lands through clear rules and strong accountability.

Environment and Climate Change Canada recently completed an evaluation of the program covering the years 2018-19 to 2023-24. In its evaluation, ECCC looked at program design, delivery, efficiency and alignment with government priorities. The findings were positive. They showed that the program's design remained sound, that the valuation process for ecological gifts was rigorous and protected public resources, and that performance targets were consistently met.

The ecological gifts program delivers strong value for money. In fact, the total value of lands protected was more than four times greater than the financial cost to the federal government.

The evaluation also identified challenges. Donors and recipients reported that aspects of the program can be complex and sometimes slow. In addition, indigenous communities and organizations looking to become ecological gift recipients face unique barriers.

Based on the evaluation, ECCC made two recommendations: Review and improve program delivery to increase timeliness, predictability and transparency; and develop communication materials and guidance to support indigenous communities and organizations interested in receiving ecological gifts. Environment and Climate Change Canada is following these recommendations and has developed a five-point management action plan, with implementation expected in 2026 and 2027.

Private Members' Business

The ecological gifts program is a long-standing, well-established conservation tool that encourages voluntary protection of ecologically sensitive private land. It balances strong environmental safeguards with clear tax rules and accountability measures. It has helped protect significant habitats across this country, and it continues to evolve to better meet the needs of donors, communities and conservation partners.

Motion No. 15 raises issues related to charitable tax treatment. It also encourages the government to consider approaches that further support conservation, for instance by examining parity between ecological gifts and other types of donations to conservation charities. While Motion No. 15 would be non-binding, it aligns with the broader national objective of protecting biodiversity and meeting Canada's commitments under the global biodiversity framework. This includes conserving 30% of lands and waters by 2030.

I hope that this information assists members as they continue this important debate, and I thank the House for the opportunity to provide these remarks today.

• (1845)

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day in the House. It happens to be my assistant Gelila's birthday, so I think all members would join me in wishing her a happy birthday.

As we talk about Motion No. 15, which is not legislation, as I will note later, and which deals with environmental issues, I want to comment briefly on the so-called MOU signed between the Government of Alberta and the federal government and what people are increasingly calling Schrödinger's pipeline.

Members will be familiar with the reference to Schrödinger's cat, the thought experiment that if a cat is in a box and subject to certain events or conditions, we can think of the cat as both existing and not existing at the same time. I think this is, in a way, a model for the Prime Minister when it comes to pipeline politics. He wants to deliver Schrödinger's pipeline, a pipeline that does not exist to some voters, maybe in British Columbia, or members of his British Columbia caucus, and that does exist to other voters in other regions.

Notwithstanding the good intentions and the best efforts of the Government of Alberta, we are still very much dealing with Schrödinger's pipeline: that is, with a process that, by design, has built-in veto points. We continue to have a government that is, I think, fundamentally dishonest about these issues, in terms of not offering the clear process that it very much could offer: that is, committing to approve national infrastructure projects that are in the jurisdiction of the national government.

I look forward to a time when we have a Conservative government in office and we are not merely talking about thought experiments for pipelines that might both exist and not exist at the same time, but we can actually have a real pipeline that is helping to deliver the economic development and the job opportunities that our country so desperately needs.

On Motion No. 15, this is a private member's motion put forward by a member of the government. Members know that there is a process here where there is a random draw. That random draw deter-

mines which members, and in what order, can put forward private members' bills or motions. That draw is very important for members. All of us work hard to get elected. It is quite a thing, as soon as we get here, to, as a result of random chance, be able to move forward a bill or not.

I have been unlucky for the previous few Parliaments. I have not had a chance to bring forward a bill to debate. I did a little better in this Parliament, so I will have an opportunity soon to table a bill. I will not tell members what it is yet, but I know that the member for Winnipeg North has already committed to voting for it.

Members have a choice of what they can do with their time slot. This member obviously did very well in the random draw. He has an opportunity to put forward a bill or a motion. He put forward a motion regarding the donation of ecological properties. The motion is, I think, in many respects, ambiguous. It does not call on the government to necessarily make specific changes. The nature of a motion does not require those changes. It asks the government to recognize the importance of an existing tax credit, to recognize the importance of granting a tax credit equivalent to monetary donations for the donation of land, and to consider amending the Income Tax Act to ensure tax fairness among different types of conservation donations.

This is fairly vague. It is non-binding, and it does not require the Government of Canada to do anything. Respectfully, I think that if the member has convictions regarding a particular issue, he could have at least put forward a motion that more precisely directs the government to take certain action. He could have put forward a bill that would effect the change he wants to see occur. He has chosen not to do that.

• (1850)

It is sort of curious to me, why these particular choices were made. Why would a member choose to put forward a vague motion? I think maybe it has a political audience. It is designed to signal that there is a certain practice that they consider praiseworthy, so they want to associate themselves with that practice, show general approval for that practice and associate themselves with the good feelings associated with that practice, but it is a missed opportunity, when we could actually change the law. An elected member of Parliament who does well in the draw has the power to actually change the law with what they put forward.

However, to be fair to the hon. member, I suspect that in many cases in the government caucus, the way this happens is that a member comes forward, and I have no proof of this, to cabinet and says, "Here is something I want to do". Cabinet says, "We do not actually want to do that, but we want to make it look like we are sympathetic to people who think we should do that, so instead of actually making the change you want to make, we think you should just put forward a motion that presents these good feelings."

Just as I spoke earlier about Schrödinger's pipeline that both exists and does not exist at the same time, Motion No. 15 sort of brings us Schrödinger's Income Tax Act changes; that is, they can be shown to exist in the sense of concern and interest expressed through the motion, but the change has not actually been made. I just note the obvious. If the government actually wanted to do this, it could have done it in the budget.

We just had a budget tabled. If the government was serious about the policy in Motion No. 15, if they actually wanted to do this and if the member had persuaded his own Liberal colleagues and those who sit in cabinet, then the policy of the government would already have been established and we would have seen the measures moving forward. They chose not to do that and to instead use this motion to signal an interest in something without actually doing it.

More fundamentally, the ambiguity around the measure is important to note, because as it stands right now, the ecological gifts program, generally speaking, provides equal treatment of land donations and cash donations. However, there are certain adjustments or modifications that are being made to reflect some of the costs that are associated with an in-kind donation, costs such as appraisal and legal fees. As such, there is an equal treatment subject to certain limitations or modifications that take into consideration the reality of the costs associated with that transaction.

Is the goal of the member to say that a person who donates in kind as opposed to cash should actually get a more generous credit for that donation, or is his goal equalization, with an argument that the current system is in some way not equal? Those actual, specific, important policy questions would not be resolved, because this is not legislation. The hard work of legislating would require answering those questions, but putting forward a motion does not.

Again, with great respect for the member, I do not think this is a problem unique to him or unique to any specific individual in the government. It is a problem across the government, which is a focus not on results but on sending signals. It is the continuation of a Trudeau-esque approach to politics, which is posturing out of concern or affinity for some set of ideas or affiliation with some group that wants some objective, but with no substance and no action in the direction that is described.

I can say that this is demonstrative of a mentality. The member could have put forward a bill, but he chose not to. I will leave it there.

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Resuming debate.

The hon. member for Jonquière has only two minutes for his speech.

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is not very generous, but it will be enough.

I would like to congratulate my colleague from Brome—Misisquoi on his motion. When it comes to the environment and protecting biodiversity, every little bit counts. It is essential.

Government Orders

However, I only have two minutes to point out the irony of the situation. Last week, the former environment minister stepped down. This minister, who I believe had a key cabinet role, quit for environmental reasons. While it is true that every little bit counts when it comes to the environment, last week, the government unfortunately demonstrated that it did not have the courage to uphold regulations, ones that I already think are flawed, in order to leave a somewhat cleaner and healthier environment for future generations. Now that is saying something.

I worked on the Standing Committee on Natural Resources on the issue of capping greenhouse gas emissions. Instead of actually capping emissions, the government is using carbon capture and storage strategies to try to reduce the footprint of a sector that could have produced more. This half-measure did not achieve consensus, and many environmental groups said that it was insufficient.

Well, last week, the government completely scrapped this measure, to put it mildly. We are dealing with a government that is prepared to stoop to new lows for the oil and gas sector while being unwilling to implement robust measures to protect the environment, at a time when other economic sectors with a much lower carbon footprint than the oil and gas sector are being shut out. Last week, the government announced that it was ready to turn on the taps for the oil sector. We know that there will be no pipeline, but billions of dollars will still be invested in tax credits for carbon capture and storage. It is shameful.

[*English*]

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA'S AUTO INDUSTRY

(House in committee of the whole on Government Business No. 3, John Nater in the chair)

The Assistant Deputy Chair: Before we begin this evening's debate, I would like to remind hon. members of how the proceedings will unfold.

Each member speaking will be allotted 10 minutes for debate, followed by 10 minutes for questions and comments.

[*English*]

Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, December 2, members may divide their time with another member. The time provided for the debate may be extended beyond four hours, as needed, to include a minimum of 12 periods of 20 minutes each. The Chair will receive no quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent.

We will now begin tonight's take-note debate.

Government Orders

• (1900)

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (for the Minister of Transport) moved:

That this committee take note of Canada's auto industry.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) Mr. Chair, I will be sharing my time.

Let me start off by indicating just how important the automotive industry is not only to the province of Ontario but to all of Canada. No matter what region of the country one lives in, it has, if not a direct impact, an indirect impact. I recognize that, at the end of the day, the Prime Minister and the ministers responsible for this particular file very much care about what is happening in the industry and in the lives of families that are affected by the types of things we are seeing take place in the automobile industry in Canada. Let there be no doubt about that.

I am hoping that in the take-note debate, we will hear some positive thoughts and recommendations and that it will be more than just slamming the government or being overly political. Let us hear the generation of ideas.

Let me set the framework. The automotive industry plays a significant role in the overall exports of our manufacturing industry. The heart of that is in the province of Ontario, but, as I said, it affects so many people throughout the country. I go back to the days when I was in opposition and would talk about the auto pact agreement that Lester B. Pearson brought in and the positive impact of that agreement, which had a willing partner to the south that had a sense of fairness and wanted to advance an industry in the best interests of both Canada and the United States. That is what the auto pact was all about.

The auto pact allowed for Canada and the U.S. to excel in the automobile industry, and the big three were very big. When we look at the automotive industry today, we find that in order to make a car, different parts go back and forth and often get assembled in one country or the other. The auto pact industry is more than just the assembly of a vehicle. It is the building of motors, the provision of parts and the export of parts and, ultimately, even the vehicles themselves.

Canada has benefited immensely, as the United States has, with regard to sharing the responsibility for that industry. It is really important, when we talk about the employees and their families throughout this evening, that we recognize that there is indeed a trade war going on today. That is the reality. No one can just click their heels and say what is going to happen or wave a wand to make the problem go away. It does not work that way.

I believe the Prime Minister and the government need to be patient and persistent. We need to get the best deal we can for Canadians. If that means we have to hold off for a while, then we should. We should not be capitulating. We should recognize that this industry is too important to our nation and we have to take the necessary time to ensure there will be a strong and healthy future for this industry. That is so very important because it is an industry that has done so well over the decades. Not only can it continue to do well but it can grow in the future in terms of the EV market. We see the quality of workmanship every day, whether it is on the assembly

line or building the necessary parts to go into the assembly lines. We have world-class workers and families depending on this Parliament to do the best we can. We need to start co-operating more and playing up the importance of the industry.

• (1905)

I would challenge each and every member of the House, no matter what political party they are from, to step up to the plate and talk about the good within the industry.

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Chair, the member mentioned waving a magic wand. There is no easy solution to this trade war, but the government could wave a magic wand, in a sense, and throw the EV mandate into the dustbin of history.

We have heard loud and clear at committee from the auto sector that the ZEV, the zero-emission vehicle mandate, or the EV mandate, as we have been calling it, from the Liberals, is extremely detrimental to the auto sector and will cost upward of perhaps 100,000 auto jobs. It will cost the auto sector about \$3 billion in compliance credits that will go to Tesla and companies like Tesla. They are pleading with the government to please throw out this mandate, because it is hurting their prospects of success in Canada.

Is the member prepared to do so, for the auto sector?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Chair, I think it is important to recognize that the Prime Minister has, in fact, been working with the industry on this file, and it has been put off, from my understanding. To what degree? I could not provide the details.

However, what I do know is that we have a government and a Prime Minister, in particular, who very much understand the issue. The Prime Minister also understands how important it is to get this thing right, because we owe it to the workers, to the families and to all of Canada to ensure that we do whatever we can to protect this industry and make sure it continues to grow into the future.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, while we intend to secure a deal with the United States, it has to be the right deal. It has to be a good deal.

In the interim, would my colleague please tell us a little about what measures are in the budget to take action right now to support the industry and its workers?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Chair, given the nature of the area the member represents, I know that she is very passionate about the industry, in particular the workers and their families. That is why, within the automotive industry and steel industry, the government has looked for ways to support workers through financial assistance, along with ways to support industry so that it can continue on during these challenging times.

We do not want to lose jobs. We want to do whatever we can to protect jobs and ensure that there are proper supports for workers and families.

Government Orders

Raquel Dancho: Mr. Chair, again, on the EV mandates, last year in Canada only 14% of the two million vehicles bought new in Canada were EVs. That actually saw a drop of 43% year-over-year this past September, so I would like to ask the member about the logistics of hitting his targets. From what we understand, in order to hit just the government's 2027 target of 23% required EV sales for new vehicles, EV sales would need to rise over 250% within just 13 months from now.

Ultimately, out of all the cars that Canada's auto manufacturing plants make, 95% of the vehicles built in Canada today would not be able to be sold under the Liberal EV mandate.

I am drawing attention to this question: How are they planning to ensure the survival of our auto sector when people are not buying EVs anywhere close to what the Liberals are demanding with their EV mandate? I would like to hear from the member on this.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Chair, the Prime Minister has already provided comments with regard to the EV mandate. Whether it is the federal government or provincial governments, we have seen very keen interest in terms of how we could advance both, yet also protect the industry. The Prime Minister himself has been very clear, indicating that we are in fact going to delay certain areas, and EVs are one of those areas.

• (1910)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I appreciate the interventions from my colleague from Winnipeg North, my colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul and my colleague from Guelph.

I want to pick up on where my colleague from Winnipeg North left off in terms of what has sustained and made this sector resilient over so many years.

We are all probably aware of the general ballpark of the current state of the sector. In 2024, we produced, as a country, about 1.3 million light-duty vehicles, of which about 1.1 million vehicles were exported to the U.S., and we know that there is a specific interest for my colleague from Joliette—Manawan in the heavy vehicle sector as well, which is an important sector, in particular in Quebec. That manufacturing and the related sectors that are involved result in approximately 125,000 direct jobs, 80% of which are located in Ontario, comprising approximately 8% of manufacturing GDP and 0.7% of overall GDP.

Those are the overall numbers, but in each of those jobs there is a family that is sustained or helped to be sustained. There are also downstream benefits from that within communities all across the country, in particular in southern Ontario. As well, I will reference the fact that the EV future we are experiencing and growing has an even broader distribution of jobs across Canada, which is something we should appreciate as we look to the future success of this sector.

On the history of this sector, we have been building cars in some way in Canada for over 100 years. It is really a history of adaptation and change, responding to either economic pressures or policy pressures, but constantly building the industrial base, the talent base and the innovation that purchasers of vehicles expect, that the mar-

ket expects and that Canada and Canadians have been able to deliver.

There have been different eras, as my colleague mentioned. There was the key role of the auto pact and how that really set the pace for the kind of trading relationship we have in this country with the United States, allowing us to manufacture and sell into the American market while also having a good market here that was growing at a time of great prosperity for our country. In the 1980s, we had some perceived trade threats from east Asia, but we responded and were able to attract Asian investment in the form of Japanese automakers from Honda and Toyota.

There were the free trade negotiations and the NAFTA agreement, and the pretty significant recession that was experienced at that time, yet workers continued to adapt and investment continued to flow in. It was also in that period that the Canadian Auto Workers split away from the United Auto Workers, creating a proud Canadian-based union that became a founding partner of Unifor.

The global auto parts footprint, so much of which is based in Canada, was founded by people who in many cases were immigrants, tool and die makers, and people coming to this country from a variety of places in Europe in the 1950s and 1960s. They were building these global champions that not only served the Canadian auto sector and created jobs in Canada but also exported jobs and investment around the world and brought those benefits, those returns and that profit back to Canada.

We then had the era that began in the early 2000s. I was associated with a government that was a key participant when there were concerns about whether the auto footprint in Ontario could be sustained. It was not just Canada or the Ontario government but governments around the world that started to play an important role in partnering with companies and unions to attract new investment. We have been in that era for quite some time now.

It has been recalled in this House a few times that the era of the financial crisis of 2007-08 created a real rupture and a need for governments to go in, in an urgent fashion. We have already expressed our concern on this side of the House about how delayed the government of the day was in participating in that. Luckily, in the end, those investments were made, and we were able to sustain, retain and continue to grow some of those plants, jobs and sectors.

We are now in this new era, where there is perhaps the most existential trade challenge to the sector, yet we continue to grow and we continue to invest. That model of partnering is paying off. It is paying off with the NextStar plant in Windsor. It is paying off with the gigafactory in St. Thomas, a town that used to have a Ford manufacturing facility and now has a promise of not one but two major new manufacturing facilities to support the electric vehicle future.

Government Orders

• (1915)

To conclude, with sustained commitment, with policy alignment, and with real dedication and attention to the workers, to the quality, to the innovation and to the need to anchor this manufacturing footprint in Canada, this industry can stay very strong.

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Chair, I appreciate the historical context of this important trade discussion we are having in the House of Commons concerning the impact on the auto sector.

I want to ask the member a logistical question about the implementation of the government's electric vehicle mandate. By 2030, it wants 100% of new vehicle sales to be electric vehicles. From what we know, Canada currently has about 37,000 public charging ports, but in order to accommodate that EV mandate by 2030, we need 373,000 new chargers, which means we have to build 98 per day for the next 10 years straight. Each one costs approximately \$300,000, or more if it is in rural and northern regions.

We are talking about 98 per day for 10 years straight at a \$112-billion price tag. I was not familiar if that was anywhere in the budget or had been discussed.

Can the member enlighten us on that?

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Chair, as my colleague knows, there is currently a pause on the availability standard for next year, and I know the Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature is working hard on that with her colleagues.

I think one of the important things to note is what the direction of investment is and what the direction of sales and consumer interest in this sector are. In fact, electric vehicle sales are up 50% since 2023. That is a pretty significant growth at a time when several governments have been withdrawing some of their subsidies for the purchase of such vehicles.

I think the other thing to note, and I think it may be embedded a bit in my colleague's question, is that this is a tremendously exciting opportunity for investment in the very things that the member is citing as impediments. We know there is a lot of private sector investment in some of these things that she is looking for, and I think we can expect to see a lot more of that.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry, for his remarks. I particularly appreciated his sensitivity toward workers affected by a conflict that seems to have been created entirely by the government. The government could have resolved this conflict with the United States with a snap of its fingers. Furthermore, for the past 10 years, the Liberals have directed virtually all investment in the Canadian economy towards oil and Ontario's automotive industry.

Now we find ourselves in a crisis that continues to drag on. Is my colleague embarrassed by his Prime Minister's lack of action to resolve this crisis and address the impact it is having on workers?

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Chair, in our opinion, it is better to have no agreement than a bad agreement. I think that workers, unions and union members agree.

We are working every day to get the best possible agreement for this sector, which is so important. We are not going to sacrifice jobs by signing just any old agreement.

[*English*]

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my hon. colleague, who is the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry, is intimately familiar with a number of measures put in place in budget 2025 to help automakers and parts manufacturers innovate and support their workers.

I am wondering if my colleague could tell the House more about that.

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Chair, my colleague from Guelph, who is the head of the auto caucus, knows from where she sits how much innovation and expertise come in to the sector out of Guelph.

That is the kind of thing in which we want and are continuing to invest in this budget, whether it is some of the investments in research, innovation and talent or in the trade corridors, so that the manufacturers of autos or auto parts have other markets they can reach out to. Obviously, there are some key supports for workers in the budget.

The broader context, I think, of this budget is one that stresses affordability and the next generation of economic growth. There is a whole set of policies that undergird and support this with really strong trade infrastructure. I think it is one of the main reasons we on this side are so excited about the budget.

• (1920)

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Chair, I will be splitting my time.

Canada has an incredible history in the auto sector. For over 100 years, we have been building world-class automobiles. We have had generations of families working in the auto sector. In fact, it has built incredible communities of longevity like Windsor, Brampton, Ingersoll, Oshawa, Sainte-Thérèse and many others in Quebec and Ontario. It has gotten to the point where it produces over \$14 billion worth of GDP. It is incredible what the auto sector provides for the Canadian economy and for opportunities. Over 600,000 Canadians work in direct and indirect jobs from the auto sector.

We produce about 1.3 million vehicles annually. Well over a million vehicles are built by Canadian hands in Canada. We export 70% to 90% of them, most notably to the United States. Access, of course, to the American market is critical to the lifeblood of the Canadian auto sector. It is very reciprocal. We know some cars go back and forth about nine times before they are fully completed. It is a very important relationship that really adds to our proud history of production in this sector in Canada that Conservatives are very proud to support.

Government Orders

Unfortunately, we know, under the Trump administration 2.0, there has been some tougher enforcement, we could say, around some of the trade rules and tariff measures between the two countries, so much so that it is costing the Canadian economy dearly. It is costing us hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs in several towns and cities that are protecting and producing these cars for Canada and for world consumption.

Again, Trump 2.0 came in. He tightened a lot of these rules, and that is having such an impact that week after week, we are seeing layoffs and shift reductions. These are not just numbers. These are people. These are entire communities that are built on an ecosystem of the auto sector. We are talking about mechanics and car dealerships. The whole universe that works around this is being shaken to its core because of the ongoing trade war.

It is important to know that we have been hearing about this from Mr. Trump for nearly a year. It is coming up on a year since he was sworn in; I believe it is January. Of course, the new Liberal leader and Prime Minister will be coming up on his one-year anniversary in a few months as well.

We have been battling this trade war for quite some time. Time is ticking by, job loss after job loss, yet we have not seen the results we were promised by the Liberals in the last election. They ran on the fact that they felt they were the best to take on Mr. Trump, that they would be elbows up and that they would get a good deal for Canada, yet we have seen no such trade deal.

In fact, something that is deeply concerning to me as the industry critic is that I have not heard a whisper that there is an auto sector deal on the horizon. The Liberals are not talking to the public and they are not telling us in committee that they are even close to getting an auto sector deal. I think that is very concerning and it should give no confidence to anyone that they are going to be able to deliver. Otherwise, they would be talking about progress that they are making; they are not.

For the foreseeable future, arguably, it would seem that we are going to be in this situation. We are just starting to see the job losses and the impacts on our communities. I am very concerned about where we are going to be a year from now if we are not delivered a deal that we were promised as Canadians.

I think it begs the question, what can we do? What is within our sovereign control, within our own domestic economy that we can control? Obviously, we cannot control the U.S. President. That seems clear. At least the Prime Minister cannot and he cannot deliver a deal. We have to look at what we can control.

At committee, we have heard loud and clear, from every part of the auto sector, that one of the top things we can give them is some relief by throwing, into the dustbins of history, the electric vehicle mandate from the Liberal government. The damage that it will do to the Canadian economy, to the auto sector, is extensive. We are predicting 100,000 job losses and up to \$3 billion being drained from the Canadian auto sector to companies like Tesla to reach compliance credits.

It is really just an insurmountable barrier in the sense that the Liberals want 100% of new vehicle sales by 2030 to be electric, when right now we are looking at only 14%. This fails to acknowl-

edge all the diverse needs of the Canadian economy, whether it is rural or urban needs, or whether someone needs a work truck. None of this is recognizing the limitations of the electric vehicle sector and it is not helping the auto sector. We have heard this loud and clear.

If we, as Conservatives, were in charge right now, one of the first things we would do to give the auto sector some relief is end the electric vehicle mandate. I hope the government hears our pleas today and follows through on that.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I always appreciate the interventions of my colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul. I am a bit bewildered by the strong focus on the electric vehicle sector because the evidence we have is this is a growing sector and, in fact, it is increasing the manufacturing footprint in southern Ontario.

Which of the investments and which of the projects going toward our electric vehicle future is she opposed to?

• (1925)

Raquel Dancho: Mr. Chair, we do not have time in the night to say why we are opposed to this. I appreciate electric vehicles. I hope to own one one day, but I do not want to be forced to have one if it does not meet the needs and the budget of my family. I also do not want the auto sector being put out of business because it is being forced to make something no one is buying, and that if it makes what people want to buy, it is going to have to pay a \$20,000-compliance credit that is going to go to enrich companies like Tesla. I have nothing against Tesla, which is a great company, but I would rather that money stay in Canada.

I can go at length, if the Chair will let me, about some of the logistical problems. I did ask the member earlier about the plan to meet the logistical needs of this electric vehicle mandate. Again, we need well over 373,000 new charging ports in 10 years, which means 98 a day to the cost of over \$100 billion. That is nowhere in the budget. The government is not even committing to that. It is unrealistic.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, my colleague says that she might like to have an electric car one day. That is a little shocking because the Conservatives' policies in the House over the past two, three or four years smack of the oil lobby. The Conservatives wanted to eliminate just about every possible subsidy that was being given for innovation in the energy transition and for innovation in SMEs to improve the efficiency of electric cars. The credit for purchasing electric vehicles has been eliminated. The 2035 target is becoming less and less realistic because they killed this ecosystem that was good for Quebec.

Does my colleague still want to buy an electric car?

*Government Orders**[English]*

Raquel Dancho: Mr. Chair, I do not think anyone on the Conservative side is opposed to electric vehicles. Again, we are opposed to being forced to buy something that may not work for our families. We very much, as the member has outlined quite clearly, to give him credit, have been the enthusiastic and most passionate supporters in this House of our oil and gas sector.

I do not see how those two things do not go together. One of them in particular has ensured we have an incredible quality of life in Canada. In fact, I will note that for the gas sector, if only we could export more of our liquefied natural gas to countries that use coal and other means that have far more emissions, it would be amazing to help lower world emissions with Canadian gas. I do not know why the member does not support that. We can really help meet world emissions reduction targets with Canadian gas. I am very proud of the tax revenue it provides, including to Quebec, for our hospitals, our schools and our infrastructure. I think we all should be proud of oil and gas. I have nothing against electric vehicles, but I just do not want to be forced to buy one.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Chair, it is such an honour to rise on behalf of the people of Kitchener South—Hespeler, thousands of whom work at the largest car plant in Canada, the Toyota factory in Hespeler.

We, on this side of the House, have explained time and again how this electric vehicle mandate directly hurts workers right now and how it ends up being a cash transfer to Tesla, which does not make cars in Canada. It is a cash transfer from Canadian auto workers to an American auto firm. Every time we bring it up, the Liberals on the other side say they are looking at it and working on it.

The member is more experienced in politics than I am. Can she explain why the Liberals cannot just end it today?

Raquel Dancho: Mr. Chair, I am not experienced enough to be able to answer that because I just cannot figure it out. The auto sector is asking, please, for the love of God, to give up this EV mandate and to stop forcing it to make something no one will buy that is going to cost the industry billions of dollars and tens of thousands of jobs, if not 100,000 jobs, as some estimates show.

I do not know why the Liberals are not letting this go. It does not make sense. I appreciate seeing an organic increase of use in electric vehicles. I will just close with this in my remaining minute: The energy use required to power an entire light-duty fleet in Canada is enormous. When we talk about being forced to buy electric vehicles, we also have to talk about the lack of energy infrastructure investments in this budget.

If the Liberals really meant it, there would be multi-billion dollar investments for energy in order to fuel the energy pull millions of electric vehicles are going to need. Again, we are talking about 23.6 million light-duty vehicles on the road today. If each one of them required a plug-in every night, that is 27 kilowatt hours per car per year. We are talking about 64 terawatt hours of energy, new energy that is going to be needed, which is really equivalent to 6.4 million Canadian homes or the electricity consumption of the entire province of Alberta. No one is telling us how that is going to happen. It is unrealistic.

● (1930)

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Chair, I rise tonight to speak about an industry that is at the cornerstone of Canada's manufacturing power. Canada's auto industry is not just an economic engine; it is the economic heartbeat of provinces like Ontario and Quebec, pumping roughly \$14 billion into our GDP and keeping more than 120,000 families in the middle class. Every job in an assembly plant supports nine or more in the wider economy. There are over 600,000 direct and indirect jobs that depend on this sector, and most of the vehicles we build here in this country are exported to the United States. When the auto sector stumbles, entire communities in Ontario and Quebec feel it right away.

Right now, as we sit here today, as we speak, those communities are under real strain. Workers in Ingersoll, Oshawa, Brampton and Sainte-Thérèse are living with layoff notices or the fear of one. At CAMI in Ingersoll, about 500 jobs have been lost. In Oshawa, hundreds of workers in the plant along with the supply chain are affected. In Brampton, roughly 3,000 Stellantis workers and thousands of supplier jobs are at risk. In Sainte-Thérèse, more than 700 workers at PACCAR now face layoffs.

Just so we are clear what the stakes are, President Trump has been very clear: He wants investment and jobs pulled out of Canada and moved south. The Prime Minister promised he would negotiate a win and deliver us a trade deal by July 21. He said the Liberals needed to form government because only they could protect this country. That deadline now has come and gone, and we have no agreement. Instead of a deal, we have more and more uncertainty. Here in December, the results of the Liberal Prime Minister's action are companies like Stellantis choosing to invest billions of dollars and create thousands of jobs in the United States, despite being given billions of dollars by the Liberal government.

Recently at industry committee, we had three emergency meetings on the auto sector. The message from industry partners has been clear: The Liberal EV mandate is making a bad situation much worse. For instance, Huw Williams from the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association told us the EV mandate makes Canada “less competitive”, a less competitive place and a place that is harder to attract investment to. He also said this mandate is a “pending disaster”.

How about Brian Kingston of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association? He told the committee that a pause on the EV mandate has not brought any certainty and that repealing it is the one simple action the government could do today to provide immediate relief to the auto sector. How about Flavio Volpe from the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association? He stated the EV mandate is "unachievable, unworkable and not based in reality".

If that is not bad enough, get this: The government's own analysis admits this mandate will disproportionately affect people of low income and people in rural areas because they face higher vehicle costs and higher electricity prices. Despite all of this, Liberal members at committee defended the EV mandate. For businesses to make capital investment and properly budget, we know they need certainty. A temporary pause to this EV mandate does not deliver the certainty investors, manufacturers and workers need. If EV targets are not met, the mandate could cost the auto sector upwards of \$3 billion by 2030. If the mandate sits on the books, Canada remains an unpredictable and risky place to build vehicles.

I should also mention that, just today, President Trump announced he will roll back the fuel efficiency standard for vehicles, which could further risk jobs and investment flowing south of the border. It has never been more urgent to get rid of the industrial carbon tax. Conservatives believe there is a better path. First, repeal the EV mandate so we can stop handicapping our industry and our dealers. Second, as long as the American tariffs remain in place, make Canadian-built vehicles HST free so buying a car made in Canada comes with a clear price advantage and reason for companies to keep production here. Third, eliminate the industrial carbon tax. Fourth, make sure any future subsidies for large auto investments come with real, enforceable job guarantees so workers and taxpayers are protected if companies move work elsewhere.

This debate is about more than policy details; it is about the Stellantis worker in Brampton who rises before dawn to assemble the vehicles that deliver us our prosperity; it is about the intricate supply chains connected to the auto plants in Oshawa. We stand on the side of auto workers in the House, for their families and for our communities at large.

● (1935)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge gave a number of examples of the current pressures on a number of current plants and companies in Canada, and every example seemed to be about the trade dispute we are in with the Americans.

Would the member not agree with me that in fact it is the unjustified and unjustifiable tariffs that are the cause of the current situation we are in, and that we all need to be aligned on that fight?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Chair, I want to thank my hon. colleague for giving me an opportunity to point out that yes, while tariffs have been the catalyst, for the last 10 years we have dealt with serious structural problems in our economic environment and a structural issue around regulation. Our country is so overly regulated that we are actually approaching the point of miracle in this country.

Government Orders

We have a tax framework issue that makes our businesses completely uncompetitive. We have an industrial carbon tax, which is adding costs. We have a crazy EV mandate, which everyone in the auto industry admits needs to be repealed immediately so we can breathe life into the sector.

Therefore, while the tariffs are a major issue, there are concrete actions the Liberal government could take today to benefit the auto sector. It is just choosing not to, and honestly, at this point, I really do not understand why.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Chair, my comments will stray somewhat from what my colleague was talking about.

He and I probably disagree on the issue of electric batteries. I see the electrification of transportation as the future of the industry.

How does he explain the fact that 90% of federal funds were invested in Ontario, while Quebec was left with crumbs?

Quebec has always been at the forefront in this area, while the Ontario government abolished incentives a long time ago.

[*English*]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Chair, what we have seen with the Stellantis deal, where billions of dollars were laid out in both subsidies and direct investment to advance EV battery plants, and what we are seeing in the industry with respect to the number of individuals, consumers, who actually want to purchase these products, is that the demand is not there.

Not only are we shelling out money for things that do not make sense and that hamper competitiveness in the industry, for a product that people do not seem to want to the degree the Liberal government thinks they should; we are also handing out contracts and dollars to companies without, as it appears today, any sort of jobs guarantees to protect Canadian workers. I would say that, in the future, if we are going to make any deals to support auto companies, this should be done with job protections for Canadian workers.

Government Orders

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Chair, in 2023, I was a simple Canadian citizen, a physician from Kitchener, Ontario, and I was really concerned that the government signed a \$15-billion contract on my behalf, and on behalf of all Canadians, with Stellantis, without showing us that contract. I know that my colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge is a successful businessman in the steel industry. We now see, as it was disclosed at the industry committee, that the industry minister did not even read the contract, much less show it to the Canadian public.

Reflecting on his extensive business experience, could the member explain what on earth could justify that?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Chair, I was alarmed to learn that the minister apparently had not read the contract, because we heard at committee that she kept saying, “Read the contract; it is in the contract”. Which clause is that? It was always some clause in some contract we had not seen. Now we are learning not only that she had not read but also that apparently the legal team may not have read it. With respect to my hon. colleague's question, I will say that I really cannot understand why, with such a significant number of tax dollars at play, such a significant amount of public money allocated to the contract, they could not be bothered to take a look at it.

There seems to be a theme. We also noticed it in the steel industry, which, as my colleague referenced, was part of my former life. There was \$400 million committed to Algoma Steel, but it seems there are no jobs guarantees, because a thousand workers were laid off. What I believe we are seeing is a trend of the Liberal government's not wanting to review contracts before they hand out public dollars.

• (1940)

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Chair, I want to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

This debate is about one of the most emblematic industries for Canada and Ottawa. That does not mean that this industry is not fragile, but it is certainly something that Canada's elite are constantly obsessed with, to the point of forgetting all other industries.

They are nowhere to be found when it comes to fighting for softwood lumber. They are nowhere to be found when it comes to fighting for the aerospace sector. There is no strategy or anything whatsoever for that. The auto sector would probably not matter so much to the elite in Ottawa if it were located in Quebec.

Let me give some historical background. The auto pact was signed in 1965. At the time, the industry supported some free trade, on the condition that 10% of production could remain on Canadian soil. Before that, manufacturers were forced to have plants in both countries, meaning in the U.S. and in Canada. Afterwards, since the 10% could have been threatened, members will recall that Ontario was vehemently opposed to free trade, while Quebec supported it when this debate came up during Brian Mulroney's re-election. That election was a referendum on free trade, and Quebec sovereigntists were strongly in favour. Back then, Jacques Parizeau used to say that if he were Ontarian, he would have opposed free

trade because it was not in the interests of Ontario, but as a Quebecker, he supported it because it was in the interests of Quebec.

I would like to provide some facts and figures. The government has subsidized the auto industry at every turn in recent years. In 2023, it gave Volkswagen financial support for an EV battery manufacturing plant. The amount is estimated at \$13.2 billion in production subsidies. The Parliamentary Budget Officer's estimate was \$18 billion, which is higher than what was announced.

Also in 2023, the federal government and the Ontario government announced production subsidies for the Stellantis battery manufacturing plant, up to an overall cap of \$15 billion. This would bring the total amount of production subsidies for Stellantis and Volkswagen to \$28.2 billion by the end of 2032. The subsidies were so high that the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimated in 2023 that it would take 20 years for the government to break even. This is in addition to the \$3 billion pumped into Chrysler's operations and the nearly \$11 billion for General Motors during the 2008 and 2009 financial crisis. The loans given out during the crisis were subsequently written off for the most part. I should note, however, that when GM came knocking on the government's door for help with modernizing its plant in Sainte-Thérèse, Quebec, Ottawa did not lift a finger. The plant closed in 2022, and that was the end of the auto assembly sector in Quebec.

For the past 18 years, the auto industry has been underpinned by a strategy developed jointly by Ottawa and the Ontario government, whereas there is still no aerospace strategy, as I mentioned.

In March of this year, the government rushed to announce \$2 billion in support for the auto industry before the U.S. tariffs even came into effect, whereas Quebec's forestry industry, which represents a similar number of jobs, was left hanging for a very long time.

Even for the battery industry, Ontario comes out ahead. There were two possible strategies for developing the battery sector: leverage the enormous comparative advantage afforded by the critical minerals under our feet to develop a strategy for processing our resources into batteries; or compete with the Americans on their own turf by subsidizing the modernization of the auto industry. In 2022, the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology recommended that the government adopt a strategy to support resource processing. Ottawa, however, went with the subsidy strategy.

In Ontario, the Ford government went ahead and did what the Trump administration did not even dare to do in its first term, and that was to eliminate the incentives. The Ford government went further than almost any other government in removing EV incentives. However, that did not prevent Ontario from pocketing more than 90% of the money, while Quebec was left with scraps. Quebec projects were largely abandoned by Ottawa, leaving them weakened and undermining the battery industry.

I have a lot more to say, but unfortunately, my time is up.

• (1945)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I appreciated the speech by my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe. I would like to ask him if he agrees that, in the future, electrification of the auto industry will contribute to the growth of and gains for Quebec's economy.

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Chair, that is absolutely the case. Unfortunately, Ottawa put an end to sales quotas and purchase support measures. Of course, the future lies in the development of the electric auto industry, but it must be done the right way. The battery sector, including processing of critical minerals, would have been the best way forward. That is what should have been done, rather than subsidizing exclusively Ontario industries, because that has been a flop, as we have seen.

[English]

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Chair, obviously, because I come to the House as the member for Essex, something very near and dear to my heart is the auto manufacturers.

Quebec specifically has an EV mandate that requires 85% EVs by 2030 and 100% by 2035, though I did come to understand this afternoon that Quebec has now dropped that to 90% by 2035. However, the percentage of electric vehicles actually sold in Quebec is only 17.3%, so it is quite a way to go in a short five years.

At a time when the auto industry is under enormous pressure from tariffs, would my hon. colleague agree with me that Quebec and the Liberal government have gone too far and are putting the mandate into place far too quickly to make it affordable—

The Assistant Deputy Chair: The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Chair, I certainly would not say that the Quebec government has gone too far. However, I would say that Ottawa went too far in putting the brakes on electrification. I gave some examples, such as the rollbacks in terms of incentives.

My colleague tells us that he is representing his riding. I am fortunate to represent a riding that includes a city in Quebec with the largest number of green licence plates per 1,000 drivers: Saint-Hyacinthe. This is also the city that broke the Guinness record for the largest gathering of electric cars a few years ago. I participated in that event in 2021. It is also the city with the largest electric vehicle expo in Quebec, aside from Montreal. I respect the fact that my colleague represents the interests of his constituents. I represent the interests of my constituents.

Government Orders

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for his excellent speech. He was perfectly on point, as usual. He has a good understanding and a good grasp of his files. I am hearing that we are moving forward, that we are moving backward, that we are moving too fast and that we are not moving fast enough. However, there is one thing I know for sure.

The electric vehicle industry has a significant presence in my riding. There was Lion Electric, which manufactured buses and was told by the former Liberal government to produce lots of electric buses, because everyone would want them and they would sell really well. The company bought equipment and increased production, but in the end, the zero emission transit fund never applied to that company and its school buses.

As a result, production slowed and then slowed some more. The company shut down and then reopened. The new Liberal government had said it was going to focus on this, but it recently announced that it was cutting subsidies and that the idea of complete electrification by 2030 was over. The government is taking one step forward, one step back.

I would like to ask my colleague this: How much does it cost to keep taking one step forward and one step back? In addition to the companies that are being forced to shut down, how much are the government's spending choices costing the people of Quebec and Canada?

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Chair, it is costing us dearly. It is costing us a lot to have a government that only cares about Ontario and that backs down on transportation electrification. I think my colleague can speak to that even better than I can. He gave some compelling examples. The government tells a company to go ahead, and then they abandon it.

It also costs us when a supposedly brilliant negotiator gets elected at the national level and charms everyone by saying that he is the one to negotiate with the Trump administration. After his negotiations with the Trump administration, he managed to get 25% tariffs imposed on trucks manufactured here, even though they were initially exempt. Well done.

• (1950)

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking my colleagues who requested this take-note debate and by saying that I warned them. When we had a debate on Stellantis and the big subsidies, I was the industry critic. We had done studies.

I also previously urged the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology to take an interest in the development of strategic critical minerals in order to gain a national perspective on this issue. What happened? Canada tried to outbid the Americans. Canada wanted to play hardball and show that it could put up more money to attract investors. Three years later, what is happening? That money may have been lost.

Government Orders

Everyone in Quebec was supposed to be happy, because investments in Northvolt had been promised. Obviously, the federal government did not invest a single penny in that, which was perhaps a good thing. However, Ontario was promised investments in Stellantis, Honda and Volkswagen. We are talking about nearly \$30 billion that was announced to move Quebec's automotive industry, all its innovation, and its small and medium-sized businesses to Ontario. This is theft committed with our money, and it is outrageous.

The strategy that I advocated for then, and still advocate for now, would have been the best. It involved processing a resource close to its extraction site. Take my region, Abitibi-Témiscamingue, for example. My riding is home to the only operating lithium mine. Why not process the lithium near the mine? That would create value added. Cathodes could be produced, since the Horne smelter in Abitibi-Témiscamingue produces sulphuric acid on an industrial scale. That is where the chemical process would take place. We could make anodes. I am talking about the operation of electric batteries. Obviously, several stages are involved, like the crushing and chemical stages. Then comes cell production. Different places in Quebec could be involved in producing the greenest battery in the world.

I had the opportunity to travel to Japan, Korea, the United Kingdom and the United States with the former minister of industry, now the Minister of Finance. What did he use to say? He used to say that Canada deserves more attention, because it has the greenest products in the world. However, unless we develop these products, and unless the government provides the funds needed for this kind of processing, these are empty words.

How can we ensure that a product has significant added value? There must be an assurance that labour laws were respected and no child labour was used during production. On that point, I would like to commend the leadership of my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, who is introducing a very interesting bill in this regard. The production process must also comply with Quebec's laws, which include some of the toughest environmental standards in the world. Institutional knowledge must also be respected, such as that of the Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue, which studies the environment and mining. It has done wonders for new technologies.

I am proposing creating a product in the mine, processing it and completing the various stages. This would reduce transportation and create the greenest product in the world, which would end up in a cell. That way, we would not need to outbid other countries to attract factory projects, because companies would be fighting to set up shop near the production site so they could sell this cell. They would be selling a value-added product that respects workers, respects the environment, and is the greenest in the world. The industry is clamouring for this type of product. The traceability of the minerals and the production of this battery would be obvious if we invested in local processing. What did Canada do? It did not do any of that. It tried to outbid the Americans. A few years later, it has lost those investments, and that is embarrassing.

What is also embarrassing is the battle being waged by the Conservatives, who have been persistent in trying to kill the auto industry for several years. It is no secret; they are likely influenced by their big oil industry donors. They killed the investment ecosystem

for electric vehicles and related SMEs. In fact, there was money for all of that.

The sustainable development technology Canada program was not perfect. There were certainly governance issues, which we all acknowledge today. To its credit, however, it was supposed to invest in SMEs. Then its funding was frozen, leading to a fight that even paralyzed Parliament for a long time. This meant that the people who had patents and innovation projects went silent. What did we see in the last budget? There was absolutely nothing in it for Quebec's industry when it comes to innovation in the electrification of transportation.

I would not say they have blood on their hands, but they certainly have oil flowing through their veins. They killed an emerging part of Quebec's economy, and the government was complicit in that. I will hold that against them for a long time.

• (1955)

[*English*]

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Chair, first and foremost, I am the co-chair of the Conservative auto caucus, so I do understand a thing or two about auto. I also come from Essex, which is right next door to the busiest international border crossing in the world, where a part for one vehicle can go back and forth across the border seven to nine times before it is actually produced. To my understanding, there is no more automotive assembly in Quebec.

When there is only 17.3% of electric vehicles that are being sold in Quebec right now, and I am hearing it time and time again from the global auto manufacturers and Canadian auto manufacturers, the dealers are incredibly scared.

Would my hon. colleague agree with me that perhaps we need to scale that back and look at this a little bit further down the road?

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleague from Essex for his comments and his concern for the industry. However, my response to him is that we actually do have a choice right now. Do we want to manufacture cars with parts that make dozens of trips back and forth to the United States? It ultimately costs a lot, with the taxes, surcharges and so on.

Would it not be better to develop a product with a secure and sustainable supply? That would have allowed the industry to use batteries produced in Quebec and Canada, which are traceable and known to meet the highest environmental and labour standards. That would have had a lasting economic impact. We missed that opportunity because the Conservatives diverted the funding sources. The government stopped investing.

Do I think the 2035 target will be met? Probably not, given that the government stopped investing in innovation. The Conservatives are complicit in that.

Government Orders

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Chair, I would not have wanted to leave my colleague without one last question like this: What does he think of all the money that has been poured into an industry that seems to be an obsession, while so many other sectors that are equivalent in terms of the number of jobs are completely ignored because their only misfortune is that they are in Quebec?

Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Chair, rarely do I get the feeling that my speeches in the House are so clear that they do not prompt any questions. I think that this may mean that what I am saying is resonating.

One point that really resonates is the one made by my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton. I am thinking in particular of the forestry industry. What does the forestry industry get compared to the tens of billions of dollars in subsidies given to oil and gas companies and the automotive sector? The forestry industry gets only a few tens of millions of dollars that are poorly targeted to meet urgent needs. As for sustainability, not nearly enough is being done. This is a major concern for me.

I would like to come back to something fundamental to Quebec's economy, and that is the whole concept of innovation. Where is the federal government when it comes to innovating in an industry that could have been sustainable, that of strategic critical minerals and local processing? What is the strategy right now? The focus is entirely on exports. We are not keeping our resource, we are sending it to China, we are becoming dependent, there is dumping and our economy is collapsing. Those are the consequences.

[*English*]

Chris Lewis: Mr. Chair, I do want to get back to the fact that electric vehicles are, quite frankly, not selling in Quebec. The number is 17.3%, but it is being pushed so hard to basically force people to purchase an electric vehicle, when the industry is screaming that it is not going to meet the mandates.

Would my hon. colleague agree with me that the mandates will not be met and that they need to be lifted? Does he agree that we need to let industry continue to thrive in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Chair, I, for one, applaud the incentives that were offered. We are doing this for the planet, from an environmental perspective. The break-even point in the pollution emitted by an electric vehicle versus a gas-powered vehicle is 20,000 kilometres. After 20,000 kilometres, an electric vehicle is good for the planet. My electric vehicle has over 200,000 kilometres on it, and I am very proud of that.

We need to start investing in innovation and technology again, because we do not have a second planet ahead of us. This debate should lead us to renewing subsidies for innovation and electric transportation.

• (2000)

[*English*]

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I think this debate is critical because we need to be very clear that we stand with the auto sector of today, even through these challenging times, and we are building the auto sector of the future. We are in a trade

war, a trade war that is designed to attack critical Canadian industries, including the auto sector. There are 125,000 jobs directly in assembly, with more than 500,000 in parts and ancillary, primarily in Ontario and Quebec, but it is so much more than the assembly. It is tires, rubber, seats, a number of components.

Guelph is particularly vulnerable to this. Guelph is the home of Linamar, an auto parts manufacturer with 11 plants in Guelph alone. Guelph is the fourth-highest exporter to the United States, per capita.

We have the best automakers in the world. We know that because we have efficient auto plants and we have recent global investments. They are the proof.

At the industry committee, Linda Hasenfratz, who is the executive chair for Linamar, spoke to the efficiency and the quality of our workers. Did members know that Honda is a zero-landfill facility? Did members know that Linamar drives 2% efficiencies every year? We are the most integrated market in the world. Now, not only are the tariffs in place, but also some Americans want all the assembly to be in the United States.

The members opposite on the industry committee wanted this debate. I am eager to have this conversation, but it should not be a debate between us. It should be solidarity with the sector and our workers. It should have some acknowledgement that negotiations are sensitive and should not necessarily be played out right here.

I had a conversation with Unifor this week. The workers are clear, and their leaders are clear, that no deal is better than a bad deal. We will pursue a good deal.

Budget 2025 supports the sector and its auto workers through a number of mechanisms. The first is a productivity superdeduction that would allow existing plants, as well as auto manufacturers and all of the subsidiaries that support them, to write off their investments of capital or software in the first year. We are expanding scientific research and experimental development credits for companies that want to innovate in the space.

There is tremendous leadership in the auto sector and the private sector. There will be clean-technology manufacturing tax credits. Most importantly for the auto sector, there is a strategic response fund and tariff mitigation. That is \$5 billion over six years through the strategic response fund to help manufacturers respond to tariffs, adopt new technologies, and modernize their production lines.

Government Orders

The regional development agencies also have this. It is really important for the smaller businesses in this whole sector that the regional tariff response initiative would help offset tariff impacts. It could help with automation, new equipment and production expansion. We also have a climate competitiveness strategy which would support low-carbon technologies and indirectly benefit the EV and battery supply chain.

Earlier in 2025, the government announced a \$2-billion investment to strengthen auto manufacturing, support Canadian workers and focus on job creation and skills development. We also took steps to protect Canadian auto production by adjusting import remission quotas for automakers that failed to meet domestic production commitments. That is absolutely unacceptable. We will ensure that automakers meet their commitments. There are also significant investments in the EV and battery supply chain.

I know the members opposite want to talk down EVs, but the fact is that electric vehicles were responsible for 60% of the net increase in total vehicle registrations in Canada in 2024. They accounted for one in seven new vehicles sold that year and, in some regions, one in four. Globally, it is clear that the future is electric. Canada has a leadership ability through our critical mineral strategies, through the attraction of investment in Canada through these battery plants.

If there are displaced workers, it is a tragedy, and we are there for those displaced workers. We have enhanced and increased EI. There is re-skilling, because everybody would rather just have a job. There is also work sharing. We have heard, time and time again, our Minister of Industry stand up to talk about how she is working directly with the automakers to support them.

• (2005)

There is hope. Two weeks ago, the Windsor Star had a headline that said, “‘Now in full swing’—Mass battery production begins at Windsor’s \$6B NextStar Energy plant”.

Where there are displacements, we need to be looking for innovation. Where there is hardship, we need to be looking at solidarity. We need to be united in that, as one Canada, in this trade war.

We need more investments in charging infrastructure. We need those investments in critical minerals to build the auto sector of the future. Canada has the best automakers in the world. We will fight for them today. We will build the auto sector of tomorrow together. We will attract investment. We will support these sectors.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have a couple of things. The member across acknowledged that negotiations are sensitive and that they should not be debated here. Let me be clear. There is no better place for this to be debated. Healthy dialogue is so important.

She was talking about the electric vehicle mandate. Do not get me wrong: I am not talking down electric vehicles, but I do not want to be forced with regard to whether or not I should buy them. We have to remember that by 2030, the Liberal government wants 100% of vehicle sales to be electric. Currently, Canada has about 37,000 public charging points. To meet this target, we would need 373,000 new chargers. That is 98 per day for the next 10 years, at a

cost of roughly \$300,000 each, more in rural areas like my own and in northern regions, totalling \$112 billion.

Every single auto association, every company and every labour group that I have spoken with as shadow minister for Canada-U.S. trade says that the federal EV mandate is unrealistic and has put an additional strain on manufacturers already facing pressure.

Given these realities, will the member support ending the EV mandate and advocate that a pause is not good enough and that what is needed is a permanent removal?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, we have a pause. There has been a consultation with the broader auto sector and with other stakeholders, such as the investors in charging infrastructure and the supply chain. I think what the government has done is to be completely responsible, look at the changing context and say that we are going to pause, that we are going to adjust and that we are going to come back. There are a number of jurisdictions where the regulations have changed. We have an opportunity to realign. We have an opportunity to adapt. Personally, I believe that the goal is wonderful. What we are looking at now is the pace and the context.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Guelph. I enjoyed learning about her riding this evening. I think she is a good advocate for her riding and for auto industry innovation.

She talked about a critical minerals strategy. The problem is that there is no such strategy. If there were, it would be focused on processing.

What is happening right now? Right now, we are dependent on China, which controls 80% of the lithium market and over 90% of the market for the many strategic critical minerals needed to manufacture electric batteries. These critical minerals are currently being dumped. Instead of having a proactive mining industry ready to extract the resource for nearby processing, and instead of a sustainable and robust North American supply ecosystem for automakers using battery cells manufactured in Quebec and Canada, these resources are being sent out for export. The same applies to oil and gas; the same applies to everything. The government is choosing to export resources rather than use them to create added value here at home.

Would my colleague support the creation of a mining industry that processes resources near their extraction site?

Government Orders

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, Canada certainly has a wealth of critical minerals that are an integral part of the supply chain for charging stations and batteries.

I think we absolutely need to explore that. That is one of the projects of national interest. I think we are going to hear even more about this. Indeed, China is a big issue, not just for dumping critical minerals, but also for steel and potentially other goods.

This absolutely needs to be explored. That is one of our strengths.

• (2010)

[English]

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I know that my colleague is working very hard in her riding of Guelph and is hearing from folks about the government's response to the unjustified tariffs. I am wondering if she could share more perspectives from her constituents about how they are responding to our government's position with respect to the United States.

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, in Guelph we are leaders in auto parts manufacturing. Some of the largest in the world have operations in Guelph. We have highly skilled people. To date, the American trade war is creating mostly uncertainty in parts. I would say that the smaller suppliers have capacity. That is why some of these programs or incentives help them to diversify some of their operations to nuclear, to oil and gas or to defence. These are really critical things. I would encourage any businesses in Guelph or elsewhere to reach out to their MP, who can provide them with guidance on programs to help them if they are facing insecurity at this time.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Chair, nine months have passed, and there is still no deal. Self-imposed deadlines have been missed. Regardless of the political narratives, there is no question that the current tension between Ottawa and Washington is not on stable footing. For years, experts have warned that the Canadian auto sector was vulnerable to shifts in American policy and global competition. Despite this, we have seen no meaningful contingency planning or phased market expansion.

My question for the member is this: Why did the government fail to prepare the auto industry for disruptions or to open additional markets before actually getting to this crisis point?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, I absolutely disagree with the premise, because we have seen investments in Canada by Volkswagen. There were investments by Honda. There are investments by Stellantis. There is absolutely a diversification taking place. There are absolutely highly skilled people and support for the auto sector.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Chair, the member spoke about a long-term diversification strategy. The government speaks frequently about this need for trade diversification, yet after more than a decade in office, as the government has been there for 10 years, there has been no long-term structured plan to gradually build new markets for Canada's auto sector. Now that tensions with the U.S. have escalated, calls for diversification appear reactive rather than strategic.

Why did the government not begin developing a serious diversification strategy years ago when risks to the auto sector were already well known?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, it is not the Government of Canada that broke the relationship with the Americans, a relationship that has been enduring since the auto pact, a relationship where there are contracts, agreements, the USMCA. There may have been trade winds, but there was certainly no indication that this was going to be an issue in this moment. The member opposite likes to talk about responding to the context, but we have to acknowledge that we are in a specific context right now that I do not know was necessarily foreseeable 10 years ago.

[Translation]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Chair, I wonder what my colleague thinks about her party's position. It has encouraged the electric vehicle industry for many years and then the new Liberal government abandoned it just a few weeks ago. This has caused major problems for the automotive industry and for electric vehicle owners. I own one myself. The situation is not getting any easier. It takes a long time to recharge, and owners have to search for charging stations. Now they are saying there will be fewer electric vehicles. The fewer there are, the fewer resources there will be to recharge them. This is going to cause problems for everyone. My colleague's government did this. It promised electric vehicles for 2030 and then reversed its decision. It announced subsidies and then abolished them.

What does my colleague think about that? Is she proud of her party's record on transportation electrification?

• (2015)

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Chair, yes, there was a plan for transitioning to electric vehicles and measures were in place, not only for the number of vehicles to be sold, but also for charging stations and battery production in Canada. I believe that putting the mandate on hold is a responsible decision. Quebec and British Columbia are also doing the same thing, given the North American context. I believe it is a responsible decision during a tariff war.

This is an economic war. Our most important industries are under attack. We cannot simply pretend that everything is fine. We decided to put this on hold given the context. We will assess the situation. We have spoken to manufacturers and all stakeholders. I believe that, ultimately, the goal of electrification will not change. It is happening in Europe and in Canada. Various governments have changed their timelines and how the measures are structured. I do not know what will be presented to us—

The Assistant Deputy Chair: The 10-minute period for questions and comments has now expired.

[English]

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Government Orders

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Chair, I will be splitting my time with the member for Windsor West.

When we get into debates about issues like this, the absolute decimation of the Canadian auto sector, what we find is that Liberal members love to get up and talk about programs, funding envelopes and all these other wonderful things they are allegedly doing that are supposed to make things work, but let us talk about the facts.

The facts are pretty terrible. We have now lost 3,000 jobs at the Brampton assembly plant. We have lost over 1,000 jobs at the BrightDrop assembly plant. Honda is losing approximately \$900 per vehicle it exports to the United States, so who knows how long that is going to continue.

Every time we bring this up, the Liberals get up and say that there is a trade war, as if we are not aware of that fact. However, the problem with the trade war is that the Prime Minister has stood in this chamber and said, “We have the best deal [on auto] in the world”, as if he is proud of what has happened with the 10% tariffs on auto, because that is what he is saying: “We have the best deal in the world.” It is either incredible ignorance or he actually does not care.

I have spoken with Unifor's local presidents in the auto assembly industry and with Unifor's skilled trades council, and they have told me that the Canadian auto sector cannot survive at a 10% tariff, yet we have the Prime Minister standing up in this chamber and bragging about how we have the lowest auto tariffs in the world. It is an unbelievable insult to every single auto worker in this country.

We know the results of what is happening with these tariffs: the layoffs in Brampton, the layoffs in BrightDrop and the layoffs in the auto sector in general. We also have to think of what the Prime Minister said just over a week ago when asked what the status of the negotiations with President Trump was: “Who cares?” and that is “boring”. This is the same Prime Minister who is bragging about a 10% tariff that is decimating the Canadian auto industry.

If that is not bad enough, let us talk about some of these programs the Liberals like to brag about, like the ones the member for Guelph was just rhyming off as if there is some amazing development for the Canadian auto industry. They signed a contract with Stellantis specifically with respect to the Brampton assembly plant. In that agreement, they were going to give up to \$1 billion for retooling the Brampton assembly plant and another assembly plant. As part of that, there was supposed to be a jobs guarantee.

We have heard the Minister of Industry say, and I saw her say it at committee, that there is a jobs guarantee. We asked her in what section of the contract. She could not say what section of the contract, because she did not read the contract. We also heard the previous industry minister say that he did not read the contract, so we have ministers signing multi-billion dollar contracts and not reading them.

Let me tell members something about contracts, because I did go to law school and I remember taking contracts in law school. If there was a jobs guarantee, as the Liberals describe, how was Stellantis able to lay off 3,000 workers at the plant in Brampton? At the time they signed the agreement with Stellantis in Brampton, there were a total of 8,000 Stellantis workers in Canada. If the Liberals

had a jobs guarantee, as they suggest, does the job guarantee allow Stellantis to lay off almost 50% of its workforce and still get almost \$1 billion? It is outrageous.

The incompetence from the Liberals is stunning and staggering, yet no one gets held accountable. In fact, the minister who signed this contract, which has allowed Stellantis to lay off all these workers when there is a so-called jobs guarantee, was promoted to finance minister.

Let us talk about the zero-emission vehicle mandates that the Liberals keep talking about. When I was a shadow minister for environment, I asked exactly where we were on building out the charging infrastructure and the power generation. We are nowhere near getting it done. They are plowing ahead with the zero-emission vehicle mandate because it sounds good, but it is causing havoc in the industry. All the CEOs have asked for it to be scrapped, but the Liberals push forward with it, sign terrible contracts and have decimated the auto industry. They should be ashamed of themselves.

● (2020)

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Chair, that was a great intervention. I give my hon. colleague a lot of credit. He works incredibly hard with our local union, and with all unions quite frankly, as the shadow minister for labour.

My colleague spoke about 3,000 lost jobs in Brampton and 1,000 lost jobs in BrightDrop production. That is 4,000 jobs. What is he hearing on the ground, on the shop floor, from our unions?

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Chair, they are devastated. Unionized workers in the auto industry are devastated, and they are terrified of what is coming down the pipe. I was speaking with people at GM in Oshawa, and there is a factory in the U.S. being retooled right now, the Orion plant, that is going to manufacture light-duty vehicles. Guess what GM manufactures in Oshawa: light and heavy-duty vehicles. As a result of the tariffs, what the Prime Minister thinks is the best deal in the world, manufacturing of light-duty vehicles could be transferred from Oshawa to the Orion plant, which is going to start manufacturing in Q1 of 2027.

This is a decimation of the auto industry, and all the Liberals say is “It is a trade war.” Wait a minute; the Liberals ran on the platform that they could solve the trade war. Meanwhile we are hollowing out the middle class, hollowing out the auto sector and losing lots of good-paying unionized jobs.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Chair, I ask myself this question. What does my colleague think about the fact that trucks built here were originally duty free when they were sent to the United States, but have not been since October? What does that say about the Prime Minister's negotiating skills, which were supposed to be so extraordinary?

[English]

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Chair, it is just another example of the abject failure of a Prime Minister who campaigned on knowing the American President and on knowing how to get a deal. All we see is that the deal promised by July 21 has not happened and that every single time the Prime Minister goes and visits the American President, things actually get worse; we get more tariffs on more products, and we get higher tariffs. It is the exact opposite of what he campaigned on.

As I said earlier, the most shocking and stunning thing is that the Prime Minister has the audacity to stand in this place and brag about a 10% tariff on the auto sector. He bragged about it. He said that we have the best deal in the world, as if he should be thanked and celebrated.

As I said before, I spoke with representatives of the Unifor National Skilled Trades Council. They have told me very clearly that the auto industry in Canada, at a 10% tariff, is finished. Our Prime Minister stands there and brags about a 10% tariff. It is disgusting.

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Chair, during my hon. colleague's intervention, he mentioned that he went to law school. He mentioned the importance of contracts and of actually reading contracts, and then he also mentioned the incompetence of the Liberals.

I did not go to law school, but obviously my hon. colleague did. How important is it to read the contracts so we know exactly what is in them and so we can secure our workforce and ultimately our business and industry?

• (2025)

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Chair, a lawyer who would not read a contract on behalf of their client would face a massive lawsuit, yet successive ministers are signing billion-dollar contracts but not reading them. It is beyond negligence; it is gross negligence. It is malfeasance, and it is causing devastating impacts in the auto industry.

The Liberals say there is a jobs guarantee. Can someone explain it to me? If there is a clause in the contracts that says there is a jobs guarantee, the jobs guarantee allowed Stellantis to lay off 3,000 workers in Brampton, when its total workforce at the time was a little over 8,000. Was it allowed to lay off almost 50% of its workforce? That is no jobs guarantee. If I had drafted a contract like that in first-year law school on behalf of my client, my contracts professor would have given me an F, and that is what the government has.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, it is always an honour to rise in the House to speak on behalf of the hard-working people of Windsor. Tonight I want to talk about something that matters to every family in Windsor, and to a whole lot of families across this country, and that is the future of the auto industry.

In my community, we do not need contracts or long reports to understand what is going on; we feel it. We hear it in our workplace and see it in the news, and we know the stakes are high. Let me lay out some simple facts so Canadians understand what people in Windsor have understood for generations.

Our auto sector puts \$14 billion into Canada's economy every year. Each job on the line supports nine more jobs in the community. There is no other industry in Canada that does that, not one. We export 92% of our vehicles to the United States. That access is not optional; it is a necessity for our industry, especially when motor vehicles make up 8% of everything we export, and when our 600,000 jobs, Canadian jobs, rely directly or indirectly on auto manufacturing. One would think that the government would treat it as a top priority, but that is not what we have seen.

When the auto sector started sounding the alarm, when unions raised flags and when workers spoke up, what was the response from the Prime Minister? He said, "Who cares?" When asked about the growing trade issues with the U.S., the answer was that it is not a "burning issue". For someone who lives in Windsor, it is not just a burning issue; it is a five-alarm fire.

Real people are being affected. We are not talking about hypotheticals; we are talking about real families facing real job losses. At CAMI in Ingersoll, 500 jobs are gone. In Oshawa, 750 jobs are gone. At Stellantis in Brampton, 3,000 jobs are gone. In Sainte-Thérèse, Quebec, 725 jobs at PACCAR are gone. These are not just numbers; they are mortgages, retirement plans and our children's futures. Workers know that once these jobs go south, they do not come back.

Windsor's workers built this country's auto industry, and they did not do it alone. They did it with unions that stood up for fair wages, safe workplaces and stability. In Windsor we know what teamwork between workers, unions and industry looks like. We have lived it for over a century. Guys like Charlie Brooks gave their life for their union brothers.

I will tell the House something simple. People can stand with unions, they can stand with workers, they can stand for strong manufacturing jobs, and yes, they can still vote Conservative, which they did this year. However, at the end of the day, this is not about slogans; it is about who is actually fighting for workers when it counts.

Government Orders

The Liberal-NDP coalition has offered zero leadership. The Liberals have had 10 years to prepare this country for economic shocks; instead they have made us more dependent on the U.S. They have blocked opportunities to develop and export our resources. They have hog-tied every growing industry with red tape. Now, when the U.S. plays hardball, we are left without any leverage.

The Liberals, and the NDP for that matter, will show up with slogans, take photos at rallies and promise the world, but they do not secure a single investment, do not fix a single trade problem and do not protect a single auto job. Workers are seeing through this. They need results, not smoke and mirrors.

More importantly, while the government was shrugging its shoulders, we acted. Our side pushed for emergency hearings about Stellantis. We pressed for an emergency debate. We secured committee meetings to investigate what went wrong. We did not wait. We did not shrug. We did not say, “Who cares?”. We stepped up because the workers we represent deserve nothing less.

We have a practical plan to rebuild confidence, and that takes responsible government. We will fight the tariffs immediately, not months from now. We will make Canadian-made vehicles HST-free. We will clear the roadblocks that push investment out of Canada, and we will align our EV policies with the United States so manufacturers know what to do. We will build an environment where companies want to invest, not leave our country. There are no grand theories and no wishful thinking, just practical steps that will help workers keep their jobs and their futures.

Our workers do not ask for special treatment. They ask that their government have their back, and at this moment, facing the biggest challenges to their livelihoods in their generation, what do they get? They get “Who cares?” and are told it is not a “burning issue”. In Windsor we care. In our communities it is a burning issue, and we will keep fighting for it for as long as it takes to protect good Canadian jobs and secure a future where families can count on this industry the way it counted on them.

● (2030)

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my colleague is outlining the Conservative strategy. Its relevance remains to be seen.

However, there was no mention in his speech of a certain president, south of here, who is imposing tariffs. My colleague's leader has called for an accelerated renegotiation of CUSMA and indicated that he would be able to reach an agreement with the United States.

Could my colleague share some words of wisdom on his strategy for negotiating with the United States?

[*English*]

Harb Gill: Mr. Chair, here is what matters to people in Windsor: making sure auto workers can count on their jobs, their paycheques and their future, and that is exactly where the Liberal government keeps coming up short. While the Prime Minister says things like “Who cares?” and insists that trade with the U.S. is not a burning

issue, families in my community are living the consequences: uncertainty and anxiety.

Conservatives will always put workers, unions and local industry first, because without a strong auto sector, there is no Windsor economy. That is the difference. Windsor does not need more excuses from the Liberals; it needs a real plan to secure our border and our auto jobs and to rebuild our relationship with the United States before new tariffs hit workers' paycheques.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Windsor West for his impassioned speech.

We know that the riding of Windsor West includes the Ambassador Bridge and is affected by this situation of exports to the United States. I understand the concern about that and the impact that the economic slowdown and the crisis with the United States is having.

If Canada produced only electric cars, but there was still cross-border trade and my colleague's riding got a boost, would he not still come out ahead?

Do the cars produced here, which cross the border several times, need to be gas-powered vehicles?

[*English*]

Harb Gill: Mr. Chair, that is an interesting question. The bottom line is that we cannot impose government-run mandates on people that say they have to buy something. Ours is not a Soviet-style democracy; it is a Canadian democracy where people have the choice to make up their own mind as to what vehicle they are going to buy.

Furthermore, is the infrastructure there, for crying out loud? It is not. I would love for the infrastructure to be there so we can have EVs, but it does not exist right now.

Do Conservatives support these measures? Of course we do. As Conservatives, we too are worried about our planet's future, but there is a way to address that, and it has to be a common-sense way that is fiscally responsible and accountable, as well as transparent.

● (2035)

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Chair, I know how hard my colleague has worked. He has met with people from numerous businesses in our area, and I know because I have been with him. Of course, I am equally passionate about our labour force, for sure, but without business, we have no labour force.

Government Orders

How are the lack of certainty and the tariff threats affecting our tier two and tier three distributors in our auto sector?

Harb Gill: Mr. Chair, my colleague is right that we have been working hard. We have been meeting all kinds of people to allay their fears. However, I can say that there is a lot of anxiety and a lot of despair. There are a lot of missed opportunities as well. The talks are going on, but there are no contracts being signed, because there is a great deal of uncertainty about the trade deals we can negotiate with our partners globally, not just with the U.S. It happens all the time now, unfortunately.

What do we have to show for it? We have a Prime Minister who says, “Who cares?” or that it is not a burning issue. The folks in my city take that to the bank, because that is the uncertainty they are dealing with, and it is not something they are happy about. It might have sounded like a clever statement to make, but what the people of Windsor heard loud and clear is that the Prime Minister does not care about them. Conservatives are here to hold him accountable and to make sure he understands that Windsor matters.

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I will be sharing my time with the member for St. Catharines.

It is a privilege, being a first-time member of Parliament, to rise in this House to speak to today's take-note debate on the automotive industry. Before I begin, I want to acknowledge that we are standing upon the traditional unceded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin nation.

I am going to focus my remarks on the electric vehicle availability standard, but first, let me point out that Canada's auto manufacturing industry is one of the country's largest export industries. It directly supports over 125,000 good-paying jobs, and many of those are unionized. Last year alone, it contributed \$16.8 billion to Canada's gross domestic product. Its significance cannot be overemphasized.

That is why the Government of Canada stands firmly with its auto industry and its workers, and when it comes to the auto industry, electric vehicles are the future. One in four vehicles sold globally is a zero-emissions vehicle. We need to make sure that our auto sector is well positioned to thrive in, and can contribute to, this transition.

There are important benefits for Canadians and the environment as well. Zero-emissions vehicles are less expensive to operate and cheaper to maintain. They have fewer moving parts. They do not contain spark plugs or engine air filters that need to be replaced. They do not need oil changes or engine tune-ups.

According to the Canadian Automobile Association, the average electric vehicle owner saves 40% to 50% in maintenance costs compared to those associated with gas-powered vehicles. It also estimates big savings in powering electric vehicles. According to the association, the average Canadian spends close to \$3,000 on gasoline, but when it comes to powering an average electric vehicle, it works out to only a few hundred dollars each year.

Of course, we are also looking at reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. When it comes to the technology, investments in Canadian innovation are continuing to improve the range, efficiency and battery life of EVs, as well as the overall efficiency in the trans-

portation sector. Canada is investing in research and development, such as in NRCan's energy innovation program and its on-road transportation decarbonization project with the University of New Brunswick.

This project aims to reduce the cost and improve the performance of electric motors used in EVs. It seeks to ensure a secure and more cost-effective supply chain for motor vehicle materials through the development of new high-silicon electrical steels and rare earth element-free magnets. These new materials will make EVs more affordable and reduce reliance on trade with other rare earth element-producing nations. Advances in EV technology are also continuing to improve performance in cold weather. Most models now have systems for preconditioning the battery before charging, which drastically increases the charging speed in cold weather.

There is no question that here in Canada we have everything we need to lead the global electric vehicle ecosystem. We have decades of experience in automotive manufacturing, and we have a talented workforce. However, at this time, automakers are navigating extreme market dynamics. The Government of Canada recognizes this.

We realize that Canadian automakers are seeking changes in trade and tariffs on Canadian vehicles. They are navigating shifts in the automotive industry, and they are experiencing economic uncertainty. That is why the Government of Canada announced on September 5 that it would waive the 2026 model year vehicles from the electronic vehicle availability standard requirements, and on that very same day it also launched a 60-day review of the electric vehicle availability standard, which has concluded. The Government of Canada will, in due course, announce the path forward that best supports Canadian industry, while ensuring Canadians have choices in the EV market of the future.

As a father of two young children looking for their future to be clean and green and making sure that we leave them a future that is even better than today, I look forward to working with this government and I look forward to working with those across the way to make sure that this happens.

● (2040)

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Chair, the Liberal EV mandate punishes Canadian manufacturers, it puts Canadian auto jobs at risk and it hands an even larger share of the market to Elon Musk and Tesla in the United States that have absolutely no footprint in Canada.

Government Orders

Can the member opposite explain why the policy of this Liberal government is to weaken Canada's auto sector while strengthening an American company and American auto jobs? To put it another way, is it a policy just to make Elon Musk rich?

Wade Grant: Mr. Chair, the short answer to my colleague is no, but we have to look at our automotive manufacturing capacity. Canada's EV market has seen growth in the number of EV models available to Canadians. Now over 100 different models are available to consumers and we want to grow that. We want to give Canadians more choice and make sure that they can go to any dealership across this country and find an EV that will suit their lifestyle, their way of life, whether it be bringing their kids to soccer or going to a job in a mill or wherever they may have a job.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I would like to congratulate my colleague, who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. He made a point of mentioning that because he has the audacity to stand up in the House to defend the government's environmental vision for the automotive industry. That is so ironic, because the government signed an agreement to build a new pipeline to produce more oil. Why? It is to keep the auto industry rolling even more. It is very consistent with the Canadian vision. We are at the mercy of oil and gas and the auto industry.

Why has the government stopped investing in the electrification of transportation? Why has the production and innovation that was being done in Quebec been diverted to Ontario? Is oil and gas really Canada's future yet again? What is the point then of having a parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change?

[*English*]

Wade Grant: Mr. Chair, I take offence to that comment because I am the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, who happens to be a first nations MP from the province of British Columbia who grew up on the coast. I recognize that the coast is a very supernatural place for me to grow up, and I have worked with first nations all my life.

We have been very emphatic that first nations rights and title will always be honoured and will always be at the forefront of any negotiation going forward. In fact, yesterday I met with the Assembly of First Nations, the B.C. caucus, to ensure that I will be engaging with them along the way. I will continue to do that because I continue to lift up my province, my heritage and those who elected me.

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Chair, we often hear that the main obstacle to Canadians choosing electric vehicles on a large scale is the lack of charging stations. I would like the parliamentary secretary to explain what exactly would be needed in terms of charging station infrastructure to make it easier for Canadians to buy electric vehicles.

• (2045)

[*English*]

Wade Grant: Mr. Chair, there are a number of members in my family who have chosen to have electric vehicles and they very much enjoy driving them. They enjoy driving them and finding places they can go on a single charge. I do recognize that we need to ensure we expand our electric charging stations across the country, whether it be in rural or remote areas, or within urban centres. We do need to ensure that we invest in those technologies to make sure we bring down the cost as well. That is what this government has committed to do: invest in green future and invest in green energy. I look forward to being a part of that solution.

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my hon. colleagues who have participated in this debate. I understand the emotion on all sides that we heard. We heard some emotional speeches. There has been a lot of finger-pointing and blaming, but I understand where that comes from.

St. Catharines has a long tradition of automotive manufacturing. The largest private sector employer in my riding is General Motors. That is not something new. Like many of the communities that have been represented here tonight, it is something that, in many of these communities, goes back decades, if not a century if we are talking about Windsor, Niagara or Oshawa. This is deeply embedded into our communities. It is generations of workers and families.

There was a similar experience with a paper mill in Thorold. I was the fourth generation to work at that plant. It closed. When my dad started there, there were thousands of workers and good-paying jobs. My grandfather and my great-grandfather raised a family on a job at that paper mill. They were similar to the jobs we see at General Motors, Stellantis and Ford. That emotion is there and is understandable because our communities are hurting. Our communities are afraid. I heard that at the doors in St. Catharines. We went to the polls and I have heard it since. We have a capricious American administration down south. We do not know what is going to happen next. What is strange to me here is that the blame is not going toward a capricious American regime; it is being spread around by, and I get it, the opposition. That is its job.

Let us look at the facts.

The fact is that Canada and the U.S., since the Second World War, had a good deal going on both sides. My understanding is it was practically an equal trade balance with respect to cars being exported and imported, as well as parts and whatnot. This whole relationship has been upended by one administration. It is a frightening thing. However, this government will always be there for our workers. We cannot force an American government to accept a deal. It worries me that the Conservatives would accept any deal just to get one done. It needs to be a good deal because, as another member mentioned, if a certain level of tariffs exists it is going to be devastating for the sector.

All is not lost in Niagara. I know there is a great deal of fear in Niagara and beyond. There is a battery separator plant related to the Honda investments in Ontario, Asahi Kasei in Port Colborne, a billion-dollar factory being built in Niagara. This is transformational for that region. Despite the uncertainty, despite the issues, that factory is being built today. The construction continues. That is because of this government and the Province of Ontario stepping up to defend workers. It has been the case, whether in Brampton or Windsor, that this government is there.

We cannot stop an American government from putting on tariffs, even though it is hurting its workers. I saw a headline in an American paper yesterday that Americans are buying fewer cars because cars are too expensive. We have the solution for that, which is lower tariffs on automotive steel and aluminum. However, we do not have control now. In the absence of that control, the government is going to stand up and be there for workers. We have done it before, time and again, year after year, and we will continue to work with the Government of Ontario to ensure we maintain many auto jobs and produce more auto jobs into the future.

● (2050)

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Chair, I guess we are having a disconnect here as Conservatives. The member stood in this House and defended the carbon tax to Canadians for 10 years, and it was good until it was not. Now Conservatives are here holding the government to account on an EV mandate that is going to crush the auto sector. Honda, in my riding, has specifically told me that with the uncertainty it has paused the mandate. Now we have uncertainty. These are self-inflicted policies from the government that have absolutely nothing to do with Donald Trump and the United States. Could the member comment on that?

Chris Bittle: Mr. Chair, that is nonsense, and this is what we have been seeing from the Conservatives for years. The carbon tax had nothing to do with this. The auto sector was increasing, and it is ridiculous for that member to even point to that.

Now he brings up the EV mandate. As of a few months ago, the EV industry was continuing to grow in this sector. It had nothing to do with that, yet he refuses to blame Donald Trump. I wonder why that is. It is shocking from the Conservative Party. It is unbelievable that its members would stand in the House with smoke and mirrors. There is one reason for this. It is tariffs by one administration, one government. That is the reason we find ourselves in this situation, not the smoke and mirrors that Conservatives bring to this debate.

[Translation]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, my colleague has indeed been an advocate for several environmental issues. I am thinking in particular of innovation in the auto sector. I know that the electrification of transportation is one of the values he has been promoting in the House for a long time. That said, what has his government done in recent years?

It cut back on innovation. Programs such as Sustainable Development Technology Canada had the merit of investing in SMEs that were creating this technological innovation so that we could all have electric vehicles by 2035 in order to save our planet.

Government Orders

However, momentum in investments and in SMEs stalled from a failure to respect patents and contracts. Ultimately, these investments collapsed. What do we have in the latest budget? Absolutely nothing.

Why have the Liberals abandoned the goal of having only electric vehicles on our roads by 2030 or 2035?

[English]

Chris Bittle: Mr. Chair, I do not think anyone has given up on electric vehicles. As I mentioned, as of right now, there is a billion-dollar battery separator plant being built in the Niagara Region. This is as we speak; it is transformational. The automotive industry has jumped leaps and bounds over the last few years, and that is continuing as ranges are getting higher.

We are seeing some of the old tired talking points from the Conservatives that EVs do not work and they are not going to be the future. They are the future. Canadians are buying them. Canadians are accepting them. The technology is getting better and better. Niagara is reaping those rewards, and we will see that when the plant opens, hopefully very soon.

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I know that my hon. colleague travels throughout his riding and knows his fellow citizens very well. I would like him to tell us what he has been hearing.

What are his constituents saying about the measures our government is taking?

[English]

Chris Bittle: Mr. Chair, I like that he says criss-crossing. My riding is not geographically that large, but I do get across it as much as possible.

There is an apprehension that I think exists in all of our ridings. The closer we get to the border, the closer that is, because that friendship and trust have been broken. Since the Second World War, we have looked to the United States and the United States has looked to us as a partnership. Canadians are taking that harshly and buying less. They are looking at the shelves and looking to see the red maple leaf is there before they buy. This is something I know will continue. That apprehension exists, but at the same time, we have to be there as a government to show that we support them in times of uncertainty.

Government Orders

● (2055)

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Chair, it is an honour to rise on such an important issue, which not only affects my riding but Canadians right across our country. Canada's auto sector is the backbone of our country. We have over 100,000 auto sector jobs here in Ontario. We are very proud of our auto workers, who have done a fantastic job. They give \$14 billion to our economy. That is a lot of money. That is a lot of workers. That is a very positive impact on our local economy.

My riding of Oxford is also home to a strong auto sector. We have Toyota and we have CAMI. We have all heard the news coming out of CAMI that 1,200 jobs will be terminated, recently announced by GM. This has devastated my community. In Ingersoll, 1,200 workers means 1,200 families. It affects our businesses. It affects the thousands of spinoff jobs that support our local economy. It also hurts our township. The CAMI plant is 12% of Ingersoll's tax base. When we lose that, that is going to have some serious ramifications for the citizens in my riding.

I have always said this. I have always said that in Oxford County, our farmers are the heart of our community, but our auto workers are the backbone. They are very hard-working, highly skilled people who roll up their sleeves and get things done. What we have seen in the last few years is a government that is failing our auto workers and that is failing our auto industry at large. It continues to fail. It continues to let them down. It continues to sell out our workers.

We have had a great discussion on EV mandates. The Liberal government is driven by ideology, an ideology that does not work. The Liberals are forcing their radical views on manufacturing with the EV mandates, which will have serious implications. Brian Kingston, the CEO of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, has said very clearly it is "a direct challenge to our competitiveness as an auto manufacturing jurisdiction because it is levying punitive costs on companies that do not achieve these arbitrary sales targets."

They are not feasible either. Electric vehicles are not working. The CAMI plant BrightDrop project was an electrical vehicle project. Hundreds of millions of dollars were put into that plant's retooling. A lot of things happened, but it does not survive because there are no sales right now. The demand for electric vehicles has gone down. I am a big believer of the free market. The market should decide where a product should go. Canadians should decide what cars they should be driving. It should not be forced by a top-down government that is pushing its own agenda.

In rural Ontario, those EV cars do not work. Electric vehicles do not work because of bad weather, no infrastructure and not enough towing capacity. The Liberals failed on EVs, and that is hurting our auto industry. Second, they failed on our trade situation. The Prime Minister has travelled across the world and has talked a big game, but when it comes to one of our most serious partners, he is missing in action.

Ninety-two per cent of our vehicles are shipped to the U.S. This is a big part of our industry. The Prime Minister needs to work and get to the table to get a good deal for our auto workers. Everywhere he goes, tariffs go up. It is the same in the auto industry. Toyota,

whom I met with last week, said the same thing to me. If the tariffs do not come down from 10%, they will have to re-evaluate their situation as well.

The industry will be destroyed, yet the Liberals are missing in action once again. When they are handing out taxpayer dollars, hard-earned taxpayer dollars, they are not even reading contracts. The latest news we heard was that they gave \$15 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money, and they did not even read the contract to see if there were any job securities. They are signing blank cheques to executives while our workers are the ones paying the price.

This has to change. We must stand for auto workers. We must protect our auto industry. The Liberals are missing in action. They are pointing fingers everywhere else. It is they themselves who should be looking in the mirror and knowing they are the problem and that they have to get out of the way.

● (2100)

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, cities like Windsor, Ingersoll and Oshawa depend on stable, predictable supply chains.

Does my hon. colleague from Oxford agree that the government's delays, uncertainty and endless photo ops have made it harder, not easier, for manufacturers to invest and hire? I would also like to hear some stories from him about what people are telling him in his riding in relation to the auto sector.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Chair, the auto industry is being burdened by the regulatory burden, the EV mandates, the weak action on tariffs and, obviously, the industrial carbon tax. They are setting up roadblocks at every step of the way. That is taking away the certainty. They are now saying that they are pausing the EV mandates. That is not a permanent solution. There is still no certainty on what is going to happen. We have to end the EV mandates.

The Conservatives will do that. Our auto workers support that. I can tell us that, in my riding, auto workers are very nervous. They want action. We have asked the minister for action on the CAMI plant. There is nothing, no answers, no plan and no updates. Every day that goes by is more trouble, more nervousness, more anxiety and more panic for our workers. It is time the Liberals finally stood up for Canada's auto workers.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, in his remarks, my colleague talked about contracts, and that reminds me of the battle that took place at the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology two years ago, specifically regarding the Stellantis, Honda and Volkswagen contracts. The Conservatives were fighting what I thought was an irresponsible battle to release the contracts. We had access to them. Although I thought it was reasonable for us, as parliamentarians, to be able to verify the content and ask certain questions, respecting trade secrecy is essential if we want to maintain investments. Is it Conservative policy to want to make these contracts public and to always fight these battles, which will harm Canada's and Quebec's ability to attract foreign investment? That is the consequence. The Conservatives are saying it will make trade secrets public when firms invest here. Is that really what the Conservatives want to do?

[English]

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Chair, when \$15 billion of Canadian money is being sent out to executives and we do not know if there are job securities, that is a problem. Just recently, we heard in committee about when Conservatives demanded that the contract be presented to the House so that we could examine the contract. First, we learned that the government did not review its own contracts before signing, and second, we learned it was the government who redacted the contract, because Stellantis came out and said that it never asked for anything to be redacted. The government is clearly hiding something. It is Canadians' money. It is for Canadian workers, and Canadians deserve to know.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, U.S. leaders have been crystal clear about their tariff intentions, and they have made those intentions known for several years. For the government to act like this is news to it is absolutely shocking to me.

Can my colleague explain what kind of message it sends to families in Ingersoll or Windsor or Oshawa or St. Catharines when they hear the Prime Minister say, “Who cares?” and that it is not a “burning issue”? The auto sector is burning right now. I do not know what else we can do besides complain.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Chair, this is an urgent issue. As my colleague said, this is a five-alarm fire. Is it not a burning issue? People's lives are at stake. Christmas is around the corner. People do not know what is going to be there the year after this. The problem we have is that the Prime Minister is going to all these countries, but who is benefiting? Brookfield is benefiting.

If it is for Brookfield contracts, they are getting deals. They are making progress. How come they are not making progress on files that affect the lives of Canadians? If it is their Brookfield buddies, there is no problem. They are getting pipelines. They are getting AI deals in Dubai. It is all open season for them. The Brookfield buddies win. Canadians pay the price. That is the sad reality with the Prime Minister. That has to change and Conservatives will continue to fight and support our auto workers every step of the way.

• (2105)

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Chair, who cares? Can members believe that is what the Prime Minister said when he was asked when he had last spoken to the President of the United States

about tariffs like the ones threatening thousands of Canadian jobs? “Who cares?” Well, Oshawa cares. Canadian auto workers care, their families care, Conservatives care, and every community shaped by the sweat and determination of this great industry cares.

I come from a city built by people who always cared. R.S. McLaughlin was one of them, a Canadian auto pioneer who built General Motors of Canada from a patch of dirt in Oshawa and helped turn this country into an auto leader. Colonel Sam believed in Canadian auto workers. He believed in our talent, our grit and our future. It is disappointing that the Prime Minister does not seem to share that belief, because today he appears more committed to protecting American auto jobs than Canadian auto jobs.

Let me speak plainly about what is coming in Oshawa. In January, GM Oshawa's third shift is set to be cut, and nearly 1,000 auto workers stand to lose their jobs. Anyone who knows this industry knows and understands the ripple effect: supplier layoffs and reduced shifts in parts plants. More than 2,000 supplier jobs now sit on the edge. These are parents trying to keep their homes, young people just starting their careers, and families who have given everything to keep this industry alive.

The Prime Minister said there was not a “burning issue”. Nearly 1,000 Oshawa jobs are at risk. Is that not a burning issue? There are 2,000 supplier jobs in jeopardy. Is that not a burning issue? There are entire communities bracing for American tariffs. Is it still not a burning issue?

If the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of Canadian families do not qualify as a burning issue to the Prime Minister, then I do not know what does. Auto workers cannot shrug this off the way the Prime Minister did. Whether they are in Oshawa, Brampton, Windsor, Oakville, Ingersoll or any other auto town, they are living with fear today. Their families are sitting at kitchen tables tonight, uncertain how they will get through the next few months.

The Prime Minister also said he would speak to Trump when it matters. It matters before more pink slips goes out. It matters before more production moves south. It matters before families lose the stability they worked their whole lives for. It matters before another Canadian auto worker is told their job is disposable. It matters right now.

Government Orders

Conservatives believe in our resilient Canadian auto workers. We believe in keeping the auto industry strong here at home in Canada. We believe in fighting for Canadian auto jobs, not watching them disappear without a fight. Auto workers helped build the modern Canadian middle class. They built strong, proud communities like my home town of Oshawa. They built an industry that helped shape this country. Yes, it does matter. It matters to Oshawa; it matters to every auto worker across this country, and it matters to every Canadian who is tired of being told their job does not count.

Here is the truth: If the Prime Minister thinks thousands of Canadian auto jobs are not a burning issue, then he is not paying attention to the country he is supposed to be leading. If the Prime Minister cannot be bothered to fight for Canadian auto workers, then he has no business speaking for them. Canadian auto workers will fight. Oshawa auto workers will fight. Conservatives will fight, because these auto jobs matter, and our auto industry matters. Canada deserves a government that acts like it.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, would my colleague agree that after 10 years of Liberal policies that blocked pipelines, chased away investment and left us dependent on the U.S. market, Canada is now negotiating from a position of weakness, and workers are paying the price for this weakness?

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Chair, yes, I would agree. We are negotiating from a position of weakness. I mean, we were told in the last election that the Prime Minister was the man with the plan and would negotiate a deal by July 21. It is now December. We do not have a deal. Clearly, Canadians were sold a bill of goods and did not get what they supposedly wanted when they elected this minority Liberal government. For 10 years now, the Liberals have known that the auto industry was at risk. This is Trump 2.0, not Trump 1.0, so they might have seen this coming, had they been paying attention a little more closely.

What makes this worse is the fact that we are creating policies at home that are doubling down on the harm to our auto sector, policies like the EV mandate. I do not understand it. The Liberals need to scrap that immediately. If they do not, they should get out of the way. Conservatives will do it.

• (2110)

[*Translation*]

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I would like to ask my colleague a very simple question.

Does she think that Canada should sign any agreement with the Americans at any cost just for the sake of having an agreement? Would it not be better to negotiate an agreement that benefits all Canadians, while taking the necessary time to come up with something that makes sense, rather than rushing headlong into an agreement that makes no sense?

[*English*]

Rhonda Kirkland: It would be great, Mr. Chair, if we could get a good deal. What the Prime Minister told us in April was that he was the guy who could do it. He told Canadians to elect him to be Prime Minister because he knew how to handle Donald Trump and how to negotiate a deal, yet he has failed over and over again.

When he is asked to make a call or if he has spoken to the U.S. administration, he says, “Who cares?”

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, it is indeed quite troubling that folks across the way are still claiming that they have a deal coming. Meanwhile, they are not even talking.

Does my colleague agree that when the Prime Minister says, “Who cares?”, it sends a dangerous message to auto workers in Windsor, Oshawa, Brampton, London and across Canada that their jobs do not matter to him or his party at all?

Rhonda Kirkland: Yes, Mr. Chair, it does send a dangerous message, and the message is that their jobs really do not matter. They are scared, worried and uncertain. When we speak to anyone in the auto sector right now, their comments are simply that if we could deal with the uncertainty, we could invest more in Canada. We have bad deals abroad and terrible policy at home, or no deals abroad, with the U.S. or anywhere. No matter where the Prime Minister flies around the world, he does not seem to be getting good deals for Canada, Canadian jobs and Canadian workers. Brookfield is getting some, but I do not know about Canadians.

Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I have been listening to my colleague from Oshawa. My riding is Sudbury. It is a mining town and a union town, with good union jobs and union workers. I know that the member would understand that.

When I hear my colleague talk about just getting out of the way, I have to say that union members feel that means you are not supporting them. When you have Unifor that has—

The Chair: The member has used the word “you” twice, referring to the Chair. I would remind the member to speak through the Chair to the member.

Viviane Lapointe: Mr. Chair, Unifor has endorsed the budget and the actions of this government in ensuring that we are there for workers. When my colleagues talk about getting out of the way, do they understand the impact that has on workers who then feel they are essentially saying they would not be there for workers?

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Chair, I am not quite sure the member understood what I said. I certainly did not say that we should get out of the way. We are standing for auto workers. We called this debate tonight because we care about what is going on.

If anyone needs to get out of the way, I would say the Liberals should get out of the way so that Conservatives can get the job done.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I will be sharing my time with the member for Sudbury.

It is a privilege to rise today in the House to speak about Canada's trade and economic relationship with the United States and the implications for a foundational employer in my riding of Oakville West, Canada's automotive industry. I know this because, before my election to this Parliament, I worked in the field of industrial automation for many years. I have visited automotive factories in both Canada and the United States, and I know the value of the Canadian workers.

North America encompasses a \$42-trillion regional market of around 500 million consumers, and Canada's economic partnership with the United States is one of the most significant. Today, approximately 75% of Canadian exports are destined for the U.S. market. Canadian companies operating south of the border employ more than 800,000 Americans. This is a relationship built on decades of collaboration, integration, predictability and mutual benefit.

However, we must acknowledge that the foundation of this relationship is shifting. The United States has moved away from its traditional support for multilateralism and open trade toward a more transactional and managed bilateral approach. This shift has real consequences. Tariffs up to 50% on Canadian steel, aluminum, autos, trucks and other critical exports are not only economically harmful; they are destabilizing.

Canada-U.S. trade is, without question, fundamental to Canada's automotive industry, one of the most integrated industries in the world. Our integrated auto sector is the result of generations of co-operation, going back to 1965 with the auto pact and later the Canada-U.S. FTA, followed by NAFTA and then CUSMA. All of these have had numerous benefits for both Canada and the United States, including lower costs, sustained investments and good middle-class jobs on both sides of the border. U.S. tariffs disrupt supply chains, inflate costs and weaken our collective ability to confront global challenges, particularly those posed by non-market economies.

It is because of the importance of the automotive industry that our government is focused on redefining our economic relationship with the U.S., diversifying Canada's exports and building one Canadian economy. Redefining our economic relationship with the United States will have significant implications for both nations' automotive industries, given their deeply integrated nature. At every step, the Prime Minister has been clear: We will defend Canadian workers and businesses. Our goal is a strong and reliable automotive industry that benefits Canadian workers. This sector requires more efficient access to supply chains, resources, critical minerals, skilled workers and innovation, all of which Canada possesses.

Our government also recognizes that the upcoming scheduled review of CUSMA represents an opportunity to review this trade agreement with our North American partners. We are preparing for the review of CUSMA and will work constructively with our American counterparts to restore stability to our auto sector. The government recently concluded a second round of extensive public consultations on CUSMA to ensure that CUSMA continues to reflect Canada's national interests. We will continue to engage with

Government Orders

provinces, territories, indigenous communities, industry groups, labour organizations and Canada at large to gather input to prepare for this review.

At the same time, this government understands that the old model can no longer be counted on. We must chart a new path that reflects the realities of today's global economy and the needs of Canadians, one that recognizes the importance of the U.S. market while also seizing trade opportunities with new, reliable partners.

We are committed to defending Canadian workers and industries and our sovereignty. We have passed the One Canadian Economy Act, which will make Canada more competitive by eliminating internal barriers and accelerating nation-building projects.

We recognize that we must go further. That is why the Prime Minister announced that the government will launch a new trade diversification strategy, which will guide our efforts to deepen Canada's trading relationships globally.

We are capitalizing on our existing trade agreements with the EU, the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership countries, South Korea, the United Kingdom, and new partners such as Ecuador and Indonesia. We are also negotiating trade agreements with emerging markets like ASEAN, the Philippines, Thailand, India, the U.A.E. and the Mercosur bloc in South America. As we work tirelessly to modernize and expand trade agreements, remove barriers and deepen co-operation with reliable trading partners, we will also continue to engage constructively with the United States and Mexico to advance common interests while safeguarding Canadian sovereignty and prosperity.

In conclusion, our commitment to building a new Canada-U.S. trade and economic relationship is firm. We will continue to advance Canadian interests. We will remain constructive and focused, and we will do what is necessary to support Canadian workers.

• (2115)

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Chair, I found it fascinating to listen to the member and her Liberal talking points because she really did not touch much on the crisis we are having in the auto sector today.

Government Orders

In my region of Niagara, the auto sector has played a pivotal role over history. It is literally responsible for the creation of our industrial core in Niagara. I wonder if the hon. member might tell me, given the billions of dollars that the government has risked in the EV sector, what happens if it all falls apart? What is her answer for the billions of dollars that may be lost and the jobs that may be lost? What is the pivot if the EV sector actually fails?

• (2120)

Sima Acan: Mr. Chair, I share the same concerns for our auto industry as my colleague from the Niagara region. My riding of Oakville West is a place of auto workers. Unlike the member opposite, I have taken the time since I was elected to meet with industrial leaders, visit factories and listen to the workers. They are highly supportive of the EV mandate, which reflects global trends in a field where Canada is a leader.

We will continue supporting our industries, not only the EV mandate, but also expansions of factories, such as the Ford factory in my riding of Oakville.

[*Translation*]

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I know that we are debating an issue that is very important to my colleague.

In fact, I would like to know if she would talk to us a little about the generational investments that our government is committed to, specifically the strategic response fund included in budget 2025.

[*English*]

Sima Acan: Mr. Chair, auto manufacturing contributes over \$16 billion to Canada's GDP and employs over 100,000 Canadians.

Through budget 2025, the strategic response fund, which is \$5 billion of investment, would support Canadian industries for a stronger and more resilient Canada. This fund would support Canadian businesses exposed to U.S. tariffs, including auto workers across the country and those in my riding of Oakville West. This will also allow our industry to pivot, adapt and diversify as we negotiate a new trade relationship with the U.S.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Chair, the member opposite spoke of supply chains and CUSMA. She may have heard of the Gordie Howe International Bridge and how it is a lifeline for cross-border trade. However, the government keeps pushing deadlines and ignoring emails from local leaders and public servants like me. Can my colleague outline how her party's leadership would restore competence and accountability to this critical project?

Sima Acan: Mr. Chair, our plan is out there. It is budget 2025, and it is available to the public. Everybody knows our plan, and this is the plan we are behind.

I want to remind my colleague from the Conservative Party that, on April 2, 2025, the Conservative leader called for an accelerated renegotiation of the CUSMA agreement and has stated that he would get a deal with the United States.

I would like to ask my colleague this: Do Conservatives believe that any deal with the United States is better than no deal, even if it means our strategic sectors would have tariffs maintained?

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my colleague from Oakville and I serve on the Liberal auto caucus together. We

have visited auto plants together, which I know is really important to her riding and mine.

The member mentioned CUSMA, and the member opposite asked about its pertinence. I would like the member to talk about the pertinence of CUSMA, the actual lifeline. Can she tell the House more about the government's response on tariffs, the importance of ongoing negotiations and the importance of CUSMA?

Sima Acan: Mr. Chair, my colleague for Guelph and I worked together for seven months on the auto caucus, which she chairs, and we successfully met with leaders of the industry.

I have confidence in our Prime Minister to get our country a good deal. The government wants a good deal. We do not want a rushed deal, which will not work for Canadians. We definitely do not want a bad deal. We currently have the best deal out of all the trading partners of the United States, and we know that the government is working to secure a deal that is suitable for all Canadians and our workers.

Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Chair, it is my pleasure to participate in the debate to highlight how the government is delivering on our commitment to protect not only Canada's automotive industry but also its workers.

• (2125)

[*Translation*]

For decades, the Canadian auto industry has created good jobs for the middle class and stimulated economic growth that benefits all Canadians. It is truly a powerful economic engine.

[*English*]

Today's Canadian auto sector, like so many industries, is navigating a highly uncertain stretch of highway. The global trade landscape is rapidly changing as the U.S. fundamentally transforms all of its business relationships.

[*Translation*]

We can no longer rely on our most important trading relationship like we used to. We need to strengthen our capacity at home. Our government has taken strategic steps to help workers and businesses in the sectors most affected by U.S. tariffs. One of those, of course, is the auto industry.

[English]

Before I begin detailing our government's support for the auto sector, I will illustrate how vital it is to Canada. The industry provides approximately 125,000 direct jobs, while it supports more than 500,000 Canadians across the country. It makes up approximately 8% of Canada's manufacturing GDP and 0.7% of the country's overall GDP.

[Translation]

In 2024, Canada produced roughly 1.3 million light vehicles, of which approximately 1.1 million were exported to the United States.

[English]

Our government acted quickly to support Canada's auto sector as it is trying to deal with the challenges of the U.S. trade actions. Within days of the tariff imposition, our government implemented an auto remission framework that incentivized production and investment in Canada. It allowed automakers that continue to manufacture vehicles in Canada to import a set quantity of U.S.-assembled, CUSMA-compliant vehicles into our country free of counter-measure tariffs imposed by our government.

[Translation]

However, companies must maintain specific production levels and follow through on their planned investments in Canada. The main objective is to maintain Canada's auto manufacturing footprint and protect Canadian workers.

[English]

Our government has also shown it is willing to take decisive action to protect Canadian jobs. Earlier this fall, we announced significant reductions to the import quotas of General Motors and Stellantis. These decisive steps followed the automakers' unacceptable decisions to scale back their manufacturing presence in Canada, a move that directly breached their commitments to the country and Canadian workers.

[Translation]

General Motors' decision to cut production at its Oshawa and Ingersoll facilities and Stellantis' decision to cancel all production plans at its Brampton assembly plant constitute a repudiation of their commitments.

[English]

Our government has done even more to support Canada's auto industry. We are transforming our economy to build a more resilient and diversified future. As part of this effort, we are positioning our businesses to thrive. Many businesses that have relied most heavily on trade with the U.S. need temporary immediate relief from liquidation pressures. The auto sector falls into this category.

[Translation]

That is why our government announced last September its intent to make targeted regulatory adjustments to help the automotive sector stay competitive during this period of uncertainty caused by U.S. trade and policy measures. Changing the policy to remove the

Government Orders

target for the 2026 model year vehicles will help reduce the economic pressure caused by tariffs.

[English]

We are taking a measured approach, supporting our industries today while keeping a clear focus on a sustainable future.

[Translation]

Our government responded quickly, forcefully, and decisively to the unfair tariffs the United States imposed on Canadian products.

[English]

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Chair, once again, I am listening to a member opposite rifle through all the Liberal talking points. We are here to talk about the auto sector, not about other issues to deflect from the main topic.

My region of Niagara, in the 20th century, was the hub for manufacturing. In 1969, 47% of all jobs in the Niagara area were in the auto sector. In 2008, there were 4,000 direct jobs. In 2014, that number shrunk to 2,900. Today, there are only 1,400 people employed in the auto sector.

Can the hon. member explain how the Liberals' plan for the auto sector has any value? Can they look our auto workers in the eye in Niagara and say they have a plan?

• (2130)

Viviane Lapointe: Mr. Chair, earlier this evening I talked about being the MP for the riding of Sudbury, which is heavily reliant on mining as its sector, so I understand when a community is very reliant on a particular sector that creates and offers good-paying jobs and the impact it may have in that community when that industry is threatened.

In this case, we have heard our Prime Minister often say that we can only control what we can control, and that is why we have seen our government put in really important measures to protect and support our automotive industry, as well as the workers in that industry.

Fred Davies: Mr. Chair, the hon. member said, as the Prime Minister said, we can only control what we control, but what that is actually saying is that they control nothing. There is nothing in this economic situation today, particularly in the auto sector, where they have any control. We have seen thousands of jobs leave for the south to the U.S. Contracts are being broken. Auto sector jobs are disappearing day over day, and industrial sector jobs are disappearing as well.

I wonder how that member can actually stand in the House with a straight face to say that they can only control what they can control. What does that mean?

Viviane Lapointe: Mr. Chair, I actually welcome that question because it allows me to talk about what we have done and the reaction that has received from people who are directly impacted.

Government Orders

I will quote Unifor, the largest private sector union in Canada with over 300,000 members: “Building a resilient economy means ensuring that the commitments outlined in the federal budget translate into good, union jobs for Canadian workers”. That is about the budget we tabled here just last month, and that was Unifor national president, Lana Payne, who also said, “Trump's tariffs are an existential threat, and Canada must fight back to protect working families and industries alike.” Unifor supports the 2025 budget and the measures we have taken as a government.

[*Translation*]

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I would first like to thank my colleague for her solidarity with the automobile sector, workers, and industries. She knows Sudbury very well. There are times of great success and there are times of contraction. I would like to give her the opportunity to talk about how important it is to have a government that has measures in place to support industries and workers. I would also like her to tell us what she finds most remarkable or useful in budget 2025.

Viviane Lapointe: Mr. Chair, as a government, it is very important for us to stand up for the industry and Canadian workers. We need to have a strategic plan that addresses both priorities. We need to help not only the industry, but also the workers and to protect jobs that offer so much to a community. That is why our government's plan addresses these two very important priorities.

[*English*]

Fred Davies: Mr. Chair, I have many friends who, growing up in Niagara, worked at GM at the engine plant or worked at Ford at the glass plant. My colleague from Niagara Falls will remember that, as he worked in one of the plants when he was a teenager. All of that has disappeared.

I am just wondering, as all of these companies and all of these jobs have—

The Chair: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Viviane Lapointe: Mr. Chair, that question allows me once again to talk about the reaction we have received in the industry. The Global Automakers of Canada, the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association and the Automotive Industries Association of Canada are all very supportive of the steps our government has taken.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Chair, I will be splitting my time with the member for the beautiful riding of Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake.

The Prime Minister told Canadians he would fight for a stronger Canada. He urged voters to look past a decade of Liberal failures, insisting he would negotiate a win and fight for Canadian jobs, but since the election, “elbows up” has turned into “who cares?” No trade deals have materialized and tariffs remain in place, while jobs and investment have fled the country in record numbers. It is no wonder that so many Canadians who cast a ballot for the Liberals are now feeling voter remorse, because this government is a lemon.

The Prime Minister and his cabinet pretend they are steering in a different direction than the past 10 years under Justin Trudeau, but all they have really done is roll back the odometer and slap on some BNG, bold new graphics, because underneath the decals and fresh

paint, the government is still the same worn-out rust bucket, incapable of moving this country forward at all, let alone at speeds Canadians have never seen before. Nowhere is that more evident than in the Liberal government's mishandling of the Canadian automotive industry.

The Prime Minister did not just promise a win; he promised he alone could stand up to Donald Trump and protect Canadian workers. What we have seen instead is the opposite: instability, layoffs and investment fleeing Canada. The government's failure to stand up for this critical industry has workers across the country fearing they will be out of work by Christmas, and reports today now confirm just how incompetent the Liberal government has been at protecting Canadian jobs.

More than \$220 million in federal funding went to Stellantis before it announced it was shifting production to the United States, and at Algoma Steel, the Liberals approved \$400 million in loans, even though they knew the company's business plan included major layoffs. They are literally subsidizing the loss of Canadian jobs. Folks who work in the auto industry, including those at Honda in my community of Alliston, know their livelihoods could be next, because if the government will not fight for workers in Brampton, Windsor, Oshawa or the Soo, it will not fight for them either.

If the Liberals' failure to stand up to the United States was not bad enough, an equally serious and entirely self-inflicted threat to the Canadian auto industry comes from their own policies. Their obsessive push for an EV mandate has created uncertainty across the sector. For years, they have warned manufacturers and consumers that gas-powered vehicles would be banned, only to delay its implementation and repeatedly review and assess it. It has been delayed again, and there is still no clarity on what comes next.

How can an industry that plans years in advance function when the Liberal government cannot provide even the most basic certainty?

Automakers are finalizing their 2028 models today, but they are still guessing at what they will be able to manufacture under this shifting mandate. This has nothing to do with Donald Trump or the United States. The uncertainty choking the Canadian auto industry is made in Ottawa by the Liberals. They boast about supporting pipelines while key ministers work behind the scenes to stop them from ever being built. They scrapped the consumer carbon tax only to impose a harsher industrial version that lands squarely on manufacturers. With their shifting EV mandate, the same pattern repeats: big rhetoric about confronting Trump and strengthening the auto sector, even as they cripple the industry with policies that undermine its ability to survive.

Auto workers deserve good, stable, paying jobs in a competitive climate that attracts investment.

Government Orders

• (2135)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Chair, it is interesting. This is where we agree: Auto workers and their families are critically important. We have a government and a Prime Minister who have been there in a very real way.

The Conservatives need to realize they have to be fair on the issue. They cannot just click their heels and the problem goes away. At the end of the day, it is a very serious discussion and negotiations that are taking place. We have to negotiate the best deal we can for Canadians and our automobile industry. That is so very important. If it takes time, we do that. In the interim, we support our workers and the families of our workers. It is important to all of Canada.

I wonder if the member would agree that the best thing we can do in government is be patient and fight for the best deal for Canadians. That is the way we protect the jobs of the future.

• (2140)

Scot Davidson: Mr. Chair, it was the Liberal government and the Prime Minister who said they would have a deal by June 21. That has passed. It was the Prime Minister who said that he could handle Donald Trump. What I am trying to make the government understand is that it is putting self-imposed mandates that the auto industry cannot seek any clarity on. It paused this mandate for 60 days. That passed. Now it has kicked the can down the road. There is no certainty for investment now for auto makers in Canada. The only person who is going to get rich from this so-called EV mandate is Elon Musk. It is interesting, looking at the Prime Minister's disclosure, to see that he owns shares in Tesla. Surprise, surprise.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Chair, I want to thank the member for his speech and for his passion. He cares a great deal about Canadians. It is very clear to see every time he stands in this House how much he is looking out for the residents who live in his neighbourhood.

I wonder if he could take a few moments and talk a bit about the contradictions we constantly see coming from the other side of the House. Out of one side of their mouths we hear them asking if we have not heard there is a trade war. Out of the other side of their mouths, they say, "We have the best deal ever." Which is it? If the trade deal is not the problem, and they say they cannot fix that right now, what can they do right now? They can take care of the EV mandate. What does the member say to that?

Scot Davidson: Mr. Chair, we have seen this time and again from the Prime Minister. He promised a deal by June 21. We have no deal. With every country he goes to visit, the tariffs actually go up. He went to India. The next thing we know, our peas are tariffed. Nothing comes from the government. There is absolutely no certainty for the industry now. There is a mandate, but does the industry know it is coming? Big auto is not going to invest a nickel in this country until it has certainty in the industry.

Do members know what is funny but actually not funny? I travelled in my riding last week, and every single cord was cut on every EV charging station. People are cutting the cords because they are getting money for the copper in the cord. That is how bad afford-

ability is in this country. I hope the government is going to have a solution for charging EVs—

The Chair: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Guelph.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the facts matter here. I would like to be very clear that 2024 was actually a record in Canada for foreign direct investment: \$85.5 billion in FDI inflows, 36% higher than 2023 and 50% above the 10-year average. Canada is attracting foreign direct investment. We will see more.

Why would the member opposite not welcome that and talk Canada up so we can negotiate from a position of strength?

Scot Davidson: Mr. Chair, if there is one member in this House who always talks Canada up, it is me. I can tell members right now that this is what we are talking about here. For the elbows-up crowd who voted Liberal, just so they know, they voted for an EV mandate that pays Elon Musk and Tesla money, billions of dollars, because he owns 75% of the EV business. As long as they know that—

• (2145)

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Chair, Canada has a proud history of being an auto manufacturing nation. In fact, Canada's auto industry contributes \$14 billion to our nation's GDP. In Niagara, General Motors has been in St. Catharines since 1929, nearly 100 years. However, whether GM will be open for business in St. Catharines to celebrate its century milestone has been cast in a nervous uncertainty, thanks to President Trump's tariff war against Canada, which is targeting auto manufacturing amongst other key sectors of our economy.

I am GM proud. I drive a GM vehicle whose very engine was made in St. Catharines at our local GM plant by Canadian workers. In fact, I worked at that GM plant during my university years as a student. At that time, GM in St. Catharines had three plants employing close to 10,000 GM Canadian workers.

Today, our local GM footprint has been reduced to just one plant and a much smaller workforce, roughly 700 Unifor Local 199 members. As a Niagara area MP and the member of Parliament for Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, I have a responsibility to represent the current and former GM workers who reside in my riding.

Those proud GM workers were disgusted with the Prime Minister's reaction to a recent question he faced during the G20 summit in Johannesburg earlier this month, when he said, "Who cares?" and that he does not "have a burning issue to speak with the president about right now".

Government Orders

I can tell members that Canadian auto workers and their families care and so too do all my Conservative colleagues. Just this fall, Stellantis announced that 3,000 Canadian jobs will be heading south to Illinois. A week later, GM announced that they are ending electric van production at the CAMI assembly plant in Ingersoll, making 1,200 auto workers jobless. GM also announced the elimination of its third shift in Oshawa, impacting roughly 1,000 workers.

According to the Center for Automotive Research, every job in the automotive assembly plant supports nine additional jobs. That is the highest external benefit multiplier of any sector in Canada. According to the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, auto manufacturing accounts for more than 105,000 direct jobs in Canada, with the majority of these jobs located in Ontario. In total, the auto industry is responsible for over 603,000 direct and indirect jobs across the country. When we lose auto manufacturing jobs at assembly plants, the ripple effect it has on the supply chains across our economy is massive.

Last May, GM announced that it will invest \$888 million into its Tonawanda propulsion plant, which is located just miles away from St. Catharines and across the river in New York state. That is investment that is not flowing to St. Catharines. That investment is benefiting our American neighbours in New York state. This is in addition to the \$4 billion already announced by General Motors this summer. The American strategy is clear. It was echoed by the U.S. commerce secretary when he stated boldly that the U.S. wants auto assembly done in the U.S., period.

After eight months, the Prime Minister has gone from “elbows up” to “who cares” when it comes to trade issues with the United States. What is it going to take for the Prime Minister and these Liberals to care? Harmful Liberal policies like the growth-killing EV mandate and the industrial carbon tax have added even more pressure on those trying to invest in building Canada in the face of unjustified tariffs.

It is the decisions being made by the government that are making the Canadian automobile sector less competitive. Unless the government takes action to reduce policies such as the industrial carbon tax and its EV mandate, which, to my colleague's point, only enriches people like Elon Musk at the expense of Canadian automakers, and if they do not take steps to correct that, it will not create the certainty so that automakers want to invest in Canada.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I think we all agree that the Canadian automobile industry is undergoing a serious crisis. I would just like to know from our colleagues across the aisle if they could tell us the source of that crisis.

Is it the U.S. tariffs, which are unjust and unjustifiable, or is it the EV mandates?

• (2150)

Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Chair, my colleague said it best earlier: It is 10 years of failed Liberal policies. We have the tariff issue to contend with, but the success of the auto sector in this country was based on the regulatory harmony that existed between Canada and the United States since the implementation of the auto pact in the 1960s.

What has happened since the tariffs have been put in place? Well, guess what. In terms of regulatory harmony, there is no industrial carbon tax in the United States, and there is no EV mandate in the United States. Why are we punishing our auto sector even further? You are driving them into the United States. You are making it less competitive for them to be in Canada. They want to stay. The GM plant in my community has been there since 1929 and the one in my colleague's riding since 1918. Why is the Liberal government so determined to end that?

The Chair: I will just remind the hon. member to remember to speak through the Chair. The Chair is not responsible for anything going on in any particular province.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Oshawa.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Chair, I am so grateful that the member here just mentioned my riding of Oshawa. He can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that very close to his riding, the V8 engines that are being manufactured are for the Silverados that are built in my riding.

I wonder if the member can speak to the camaraderie and the solidarity that auto workers have in all the different places where we have assembly plants, whether it is GM or Stellantis or Ford or any others in the area. How is this affecting the auto workers in general? How do they feel when their neighbours and friends are losing jobs in other areas of the country? I wonder if he would just give us some more comments on that.

Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Chair, there is a sense of pride among auto workers in the quality of the products that they produce. In fact, in St. Catharines we do make the V8 engines that go into the Silverado in Oshawa. There is a reason the auto workers call themselves brothers and sisters as members of locals there. I have local 199 in St. Catharines.

That is being put at risk by the policies of the government not to support the auto sector. Not only did the Liberals promise to get a deal done with the Americans by July 21 and fail at that, but they promised elbows up and again have succumbed to that. Now, it is, “Who cares?” Then they put in place policies like the industrial carbon tax and the EV mandate, which are helping to drive investment out of Canada. That is a shame for those dedicated workers who want good-paying jobs and want them here in Canada.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I am a relatively new member of the House, and there is one thing that I have a hard time understanding. The Conservatives say one thing in the House, but when it comes time to vote, they always do the opposite. They talk about the cost of living every day in the House, but when it comes time to vote for measures to help with the cost of living, the Conservatives vote against them.

This evening, they are telling us about the importance of the automotive sector and of supporting workers and the industry. However, the strategic response fund that we created, with over \$5 billion available to support the sectors, businesses and workers hardest hit by the tariffs, was in budget 2025 and the Conservatives voted against it. I want to understand why they are voting against helping the businesses hardest hit by the tariff war and, at the same time, against helping Canadian workers.

[*English*]

Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Chair, I would like to welcome my colleague to the House. He has just come here, and he will probably work with his Liberal colleagues to build on that 10-year record of failure. That is why we voted against these budgets. For 10 years, we have voted against budgets that let the price of housing double. The price of mortgages has doubled and the price of rent has doubled, all during their periods of government, and then the Liberals wonder why we vote against their policies. Their policies have led to the economic demise that Canadians face.

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I would like to inform you that I will be sharing my time with the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin.

The auto industry plays a vital role in the Canadian economy, contributing approximately \$16.8 billion in economic activity in 2024, which accounted for nearly 8% of Canada's total manufacturing GDP. In my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche, there may not be a large auto sector presence, but I understand that this is a very important issue for the Canadian economy. As a member of our Liberal government, I am determined, along with all my colleagues, to work to strengthen the Canadian economy and to protect all our sectors and all workers across the country. That is why I wanted to rise in the House this evening during this debate.

This sector employs more than 125,000 Canadians and supports hundreds of thousands more jobs across the country. Recognizing its importance to the Canadian economy, our government continues to invest in the automotive sector, particularly in order to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the global transition to electrification.

Collaboration between the federal and provincial governments and the industry has attracted significant investment to transition to EV production and establish a comprehensive Canadian supply chain for EV batteries. This includes investments in higher value-added segments, such as cell manufacturing supported by major battery manufacturers such as NextStar Energy and PowerCo, as well as key players in the intermediate sector, such as GM, Posco

and Asahi Kasei, which produce components essential to battery manufacturing, including cathode active materials and separators. This is benefiting companies in the automotive and EV battery supply chain and will continue to do so.

It is important to note that these investments build on Canada's strengths. We have a highly skilled workforce, award-winning auto plants, abundant critical minerals, clean and affordable energy, and a proven track record of innovation. We will continue to leverage our comparative advantage to strengthen the domestic automotive sector, which provides jobs today and for decades to come.

That said, the transition is taking place amid significant short-term economic uncertainty and slower-than-expected growth in EV demand. That is why we are taking a measured approach by supporting the industry today, while remaining focused on a sustainable future.

To that end, the government has announced that it will make targeted adjustments to the electric vehicle availability standard. We are removing the 20% sales target for electric models for the year 2026 and have undertaken a 60-day review of the entire regulation. Our government aims to ensure that the targets set in the regulations are both ambitious and achievable and that all automakers do not face excessive financial burdens, while continuing to decarbonize transportation. We are also investing in Canadian businesses to help them adapt to the recent economic challenges, including those related to the uncertain business environment, and to lay the groundwork for future growth.

The government has just announced the creation of a new strategic response fund that will provide \$5 billion to key sectors, giving priority to those that are heavily exposed to trade and affected by tariffs, particularly the auto industry. The fund will aim to support industrial capacity by offsetting new market access costs, supporting their equipment, and facilitating Canadian companies' plans to expand or enter new markets. We have also increased investments in the regional tariff response initiative, bringing total funding to \$1 billion over three years, including to support companies in the automotive sector.

Canada has all the assets it needs to excel in the next generation of automotive manufacturing. Our priority continues to be defending Canadian interests, supporting workers and building a strong automotive sector for decades to come. Our government is there for the sectors most affected by the unjustified and illegitimate tariffs imposed by the U.S. administration. I know this first-hand because my riding is affected by softwood lumber tariffs. Tonight, we are talking about another sector that is heavily affected by tariffs: the automotive sector.

Government Orders

Our caucus is fortunate to have colleagues who are determined to fight for this sector. I am thinking in particular of the member for Guelph, who is a staunch defender of the automotive sector, just as I am for the softwood lumber sector. We understand that our government must be there for the sectors most affected by tariffs, so we must be there to protect our businesses and we must be there to protect our Canadian workers from coast to coast to coast.

• (2155)

[*English*]

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Chair, the member raised some interesting points. He mentioned that he is there to support workers and to support the industry for years to come. There are 1.3 million vehicles built by the hands of Canadians every year. We have been battling this trade deal for close to a year now. I hope that we can both agree that this very reciprocal relationship with the United States is very integral, especially when it comes to autos. Week after week, year after year, we are seeing more layoffs, and the lack of action is giving me very little confidence.

Industry and labour have warned about the risks that this industry is facing. Why did the government fail to act sooner? What could the government have done differently to prevent these job losses?

• (2200)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Chair, our government is working on developing new economic relationships with the United States, in addition to diversifying our economy through various partnerships around the world. On the issue of the United States, I believe that, yes, we need a new agreement with the U.S., but one that truly meets the needs of our industries and the interests of Canadians and workers. We must not sign an agreement at any cost.

In the meantime, our government is there for all workers and affected businesses. As I mentioned in my speech, we have set up a \$5-billion strategic response fund that will enable affected sectors to pivot, adapt and diversify. We are here during this period of economic uncertainty to truly support the hardest-hit sectors, whether it be the automotive sector we are discussing tonight or the softwood lumber sector, which affects my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche in particular.

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I wonder if my colleague could speak directly to workers and tell them what they can expect from our government in the coming weeks and months.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Chair, our government is determined to protect every worker in our country. We have already put measures in place to do just that. We hope to protect every job. In the unfortunate event that job losses do occur, we have recently made adjustments to the EI system. For example, we have extended the waiver of the one-week waiting period for EI until April 2026. We have invested in people who want to change careers.

We are also here to protect businesses, to help them access liquidity so that there are no job losses. We want people to be able to keep their jobs. For example, there is the strategic response fund,

which allows businesses to access liquidity in order to keep their operations going while we weather this turbulence.

I want to reiterate that in our negotiations for a renewed trade relationship with the United States, we do not want an agreement at any cost. We want an agreement that serves the interests of our businesses and our workers.

[*English*]

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Chair, the member has acknowledged that businesses are trying to access funding and that the Liberals are providing funding for businesses. However, Canadians want to be self-sustainable and self-reliant. Nine months have passed, self-imposed deadlines have been missed and there is still no deal. Communities are continuously feeling the impact every single day, and there is no road map. How does the member justify the delay?

Furthermore, I have two pretty specific questions. First, why has the Prime Minister taken such an inconsistent approach towards the American administration? Second, what explains the Prime Minister's contradictory approach and his unwillingness to follow through with things? He does a flip-flop.

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Chair, I would say that our government's guiding principle from day one has been perfectly clear: We were elected to strengthen the Canadian economy and make it more resilient. That means diversifying our markets. It means supporting key sectors of the Canadian economy. It means providing targeted support for the sectors hardest hit by U.S. tariffs.

I would remind the House that we did not ask for this tariff conflict. These tariffs are completely unjustified and illegal. Nevertheless, they exist, and our government is determined to help the hardest-hit sectors, including the automotive sector. We created a strategic response fund offering billions of dollars to help businesses and workers, because our government understands that, in order to have a strong economy, we must support all sectors of the Canadian economy and all Canadian workers.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the automotive industry is a key sector of the Canadian economy and, as several of my colleagues have already mentioned, it generates billions of dollars in economic activity. It accounts for 8% of Canada's manufacturing GDP.

It is important to note that the sector includes five world-class automakers that are supported by a network of 700 parts suppliers. Automotive companies directly employ more than 125,000 Canadians, primarily in Ontario, and support hundreds of thousands of additional jobs across the country.

Our automotive plants are internationally renowned for their high quality, thanks in large part to Canada's exceptional workforce. The Honda plant in Alliston and the Toyota plant in Cambridge both won the J.D Power Gold Plant Quality Award in 2024. On top of that, Toyota Canada won 22 awards between 1991 and 2024.

The auto industry is one of Canada's largest manufacturing sectors, and it is facing unfair, unjustified and inexplicable U.S. tariffs that are increasing production costs and threatening good jobs in this highly integrated market on both sides of the border. Since the signing of the auto pact in 1965, this industry has become increasingly integrated.

However, on April 3, 2025, the United States completely changed course and imposed a 25% tariff on all Canadian vehicles that do not comply with the rules of origin under the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement, or CUSMA. The U.S. also imposed a 25% tariff on the value of non-U.S. components in CUSMA-eligible vehicles.

Additionally, on May 3, 2025, the United States imposed a 25% tariff on non-CUSMA-compliant auto parts. While not currently in force, the threatened tariff on auto parts remains. It is the uncertainty that is causing the biggest headaches for the industry. More recently, imports of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles were also targeted by an inexplicable 25% tariff.

Given that over 90% of vehicles manufactured in Canada are destined for the U.S. market and 40% of vehicles sold in Canada are assembled in the U.S., the impact of these tariffs is monumental.

Our government recognizes these significant challenges, and we will work closely with the industry, but I want to be clear: We will not sign just any agreement at any price. The agreement that will eventually be signed must benefit the industry. Our American friends need to understand that this industry is highly integrated and that any attempt to split it up will cause the industry to collapse, which will not be to anyone's advantage.

• (2205)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, since my colleague is very familiar with this issue, I would like to know what he considers to be the most important and urgent measures to support the automotive sector and workers.

I would also like him to tell us why it is so important to explore new avenues for the automotive industry of the future and to explore new markets. I would also like him to talk to us about support for SMEs.

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Chair, that is indeed a very important question. I would say that there are two parallel components to the government's strategy, and both are important.

On the one hand, we need to support the industry, which is affected by these tariffs. It needs liquidity and emergency support.

Government Orders

We are doing this with the programs available at the Department of Industry.

At the same time, we also need to continue to think more strategically about diversifying markets. Above all, we must always think about the industry of the future. I know our friends across the aisle do not like electric vehicles very much, but electric vehicles are part of the future. Going forward, this Canadian industry will also have to be at the forefront of electric vehicle production.

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I would very much like my hon. colleague from Marc-Aurèle-Fortin to give us his analysis of why some companies perform better than others, namely American companies in Detroit.

If it is the tariff situation that is at issue, I would like him to clarify this difference for us.

• (2210)

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Chair, the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario have been working with the automotive industry for decades. My colleagues from Ontario have mentioned that. We have been working with this industry for decades.

We are quite surprised.

[*English*]

We will not forget the companies that are now turning their backs on Canada and fleeing to the United States. We will not forget that. We will not forget the other companies that are remaining here, maintaining their production facilities here and continuing to contribute to the Canadian economy.

We will remember that.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Chair, companies are not turning their backs out of choice; companies are turning their backs out of consequence.

I would like to ask the member to talk about the CUSMA review and the preparations for that. The U.S. has already begun hearings in preparation for the CUSMA review, and Canada, from my perspective, cannot be caught flat-footed. Right now, there is so much inconsistency, frustration and concern because we do not know whether the government is going or coming.

Could the government speak to what specific steps it is taking to prepare for Canada's role in the CUSMA review? Which stakeholders in the auto sector has the government contacted to ask questions about that so far?

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Chair, as I said earlier, there are five automobile assembly operations in Canada and hundreds of parts manufacturers. We are in constant contact with the industry. We know where they stand. We know what they require.

Government Orders

Yes, we are engaging in that process of revising and reviewing CUSMA. It is very important. We will not negotiate in public, and we will not cave in. We will not panic, and we will not cave in.

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Chair, I rise today on behalf of the people of Brampton West and on behalf of thousands of auto workers across this country whose livelihoods have been thrown into crisis.

On October 14, Stellantis announced it would move Jeep Compass production from Brampton to the U.S. There are 3,000 direct jobs at risk and another 12,000 supply chain jobs threatened. Up to 15,000 families in Peel face economic uncertainty. All of this happened after billions in subsidies from the Liberals, with no enforceable job guarantees.

In Brampton, the frustration is real. The hurt is real and the fear is real. People ask how the government could allow this to happen. Over three years, Stellantis received over \$1 billion in direct grants: \$520 million federally and \$513 million from Ontario.

I also would like to mention that I will be splitting my time with the member for Kitchener South—Hespeler.

Retooling was promised from 2024 to 2025, but after the money flowed, production left. The Windsor battery plant received up to \$500 million in federal support, and \$260 million has already been paid. Then the government signed a \$15-billion performance-based subsidy deal: \$10 billion federal and \$5 billion provincial. In total, Stellantis has access up to \$16.5 billion in support, and no real protection for workers, no job guarantees, no production clauses and no clawbacks.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer warns EV subsidies now total \$52.5 billion and that it may take a decade to break even, if companies stay in Canada.

Then came the tariff failure. The Prime Minister promised a U.S. tariff deal by July 21. The deadline passed and there was no deal and no protection. After the October 7 meeting with President Trump, the U.S. kept its tariffs. President Trump said that he would attract trillions in Canadian investment. Weeks later, production left Brampton. Families are devastated. I have with met them with our leader at the Chrysler plant in Brampton. They are worried about mortgages. Workers cannot sleep. Moms and dads fear Christmas will be unaffordable.

In Brampton West, one Stellantis income supports an entire household. When that income disappears, the family suffers. The Prime Minister's response is, "Who cares?" I care and Conservatives care. Canadian workers deserve a government that fights for them.

Conservatives forced the release of the Stellantis contract. On October 22, the industry committee unanimously adopted a Conservative motion to investigate the Stellantis commitments. Witnesses, including Unifor and the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association, raised serious concerns about the government's weak agreements and the absence of a coherent industrial strategy.

The government responded with a tariff restriction, which only will raise costs for Canadians. Brampton does not need theatrics; Brampton needs jobs. Conservatives have a plan: Cut the GST on

Canadian-made vehicles while U.S. tariffs remain, create a keep Canadian working fund to support workers hit by U.S. trade actions, and maintain clean auto incentives but with real job guarantees, transparency and accountability.

Brampton built Canada's auto industry. Its workers built vehicles for the world. They deserve respect and they deserve protection. We will work every single day to rebuild Canada's manufacturing strength so that no community ever suffers what Brampton is facing today.

• (2215)

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I have one simple question for my colleague. On the fact that the auto industry is severely affected by those unjustifiable U.S. tariffs, what is the Conservative plan? I still cannot visualize how the industrial carbon tax will address the issue of U.S. tariffs.

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Chair, because the government has no industrial strategy, it makes announcements not results. While the U.S. fought for its workers, the Prime Minister was busy making excuses.

Conservatives will fight to bring those jobs home by securing fair trade deals, cutting taxes on Canadian-made vehicles and restoring confidence in our manufacturing sector.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Chair, after billions of taxpayer dollars and countless promises, 3,000 jobs at Stellantis were lost, leaving workers out of work.

The Prime Minister said he was the man with the plan. I wonder if my hon. colleague would comment on what he thinks that plan actually might be.

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Chair, we all know how the auto sector is being impacted. The Prime Minister's plan is failing families across Canada, and his so-called negotiating skills have cost Brampton workers their jobs. For years he boasted that he knew how to get deals done, but when it mattered most, he delivered nothing.

Conservatives will restore real leadership, real strategy and real negotiation that protect Canadian workers, not political branding exercises that fail families.

Government Orders

The so-called man with the plan had no plan at all. When it came time to negotiate real protection for Canadian workers, he failed. He simply did not negotiate. He gave away billions without securing jobs guarantees, production commitments or real accountability. That is not leadership; that is incompetence.

Conservatives will protect workers, not abandon them with empty slogans.

• (2220)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I sympathize and I empathize, because it must be extremely challenging for the workers in Brampton West and the workers across Canada who are impacted by tariffs.

I would ask the member opposite this: Have the automakers in his riding benefited from the strategic response fund, from liquidity and from the regional tariff response initiative? Has he shared that with some of the parts manufacturers who would benefit? I am just curious whether, when workers are concerned, the member is sharing with them that the Liberal government has, in the budget, expanded EI access and protections.

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Chair, the member opposite's questions were wonderful, and I really appreciate the concern she has for auto workers in Brampton as well.

We all know that the auto sector has been hit hard because of Liberal trade policies for years. When we are giving \$10 billion without any jobs guarantees, that is a clear indication that government is not doing its due diligence, and it is impacting people. This is exactly what happened in Brampton, where due to the lack of the government's ability, we have lost 3,000 jobs.

People are suffering because of the job losses. Thousands of Brampton families face an uncertain Christmas this year. They did everything right; they worked hard, paid taxes and built this country's auto industry, but the government let them down.

Conservatives will never abandon Brampton families. We will fight for them.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Chair, the debate tonight should not be necessary. The Prime Minister of Canada called an election saying that he needed a mandate to take action to stand up against Trump and to build Canada strong. It has now been nine months, and he has not taken those actions.

Many people took the Prime Minister at his word, but we all saw him nodding meekly in the Oval Office while President Trump threatened to take every last one of our auto sector jobs. Today, the President is making good on that threat, and the Prime Minister is failing to live up to his promise.

When we ask the Liberals what they are going to do about it, they say, "Who cares?" and that they cannot control Trump anyway. No kidding, we knew that. We were not the ones who called an election saying that we were going to solve the problem by gesticulating with our elbows somehow.

When I was knocking on doors, people would ask me what to do about Trump, and I would be honest with them. I would say then that we cannot control him. We can only do in this country what we

can do in this country, which is a lot, but the Liberals are not doing those things.

I sat here during the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry's speech to kick off this debate. It was a bizarre, ChatGPT history of the auto sector in Canada. Conservatives did not call this debate to talk about the auto sector's history; we came here to talk about its future and how we can secure that future with concrete actions tonight. Do the Liberals even believe in the future of the auto industry in this country? If they do, why were they eulogizing it?

I have six concrete actions that Conservatives are proposing that the Liberals could take tonight.

Number one is to have countertariffs. It was the core of the Liberals' election platform, and it makes sense. Here is the math: Ford Motor Company is an American car company. After 10 years of failed Liberal industrial policy, it barely makes any cars here anymore, but it does make 150,000 F-150s in the United States and ships them up here, where zero tariffs are paid. Conversely, the Toyota plant in my riding makes 500,000 vehicles, of which it ships 400,000 to the United States, and it is getting killed on tariffs of, on average, 15% of the purchase price. Why does the government not keep its promise, put tariffs on the F-150s and use the money it gleans to offset the tariffs Toyota is paying to protect our auto sector?

Number two is to get rid of the ridiculous EV mandate. For those following along at home, Toyota makes awesome, low-emission hybrid vehicles in this country and it gets no credit for it. Under the Liberals' mandate, Toyota has to buy EV credits from Tesla, which makes no autos in this country. It is a cash transfer from the Canadian auto worker to Tesla. It makes no sense and should end tonight. The Liberals could end it tonight.

I had representatives from Toyota in my office last week explaining that, even if it is paused, they still cannot invest in their people and in their plants if they do not know if they are going to be punished by the radical, woke, nonsense caucus of the Liberal party.

Number three is to get clarity on the strategic response fund. It was in the Liberals' platform. They announced it in the spring and re-announced it in the fall. No auto manufacturer knows where that money is going or what the Liberals are doing with it. Auto manufacturers cannot make investments until they find out.

Number four is to get rid of the HST on Canadian-made vehicles. It is simple.

Government Orders

That ties in to number five, which is to just ask Canadians to buy Canadian. Why is it left to the Premier of Ontario to be Captain Canada pouring out a bottle of Crown Royal because one bottling plant was moved down south? The Prime Minister has never asked Canadians to step up and buy Canadian. Why will he not be Captain Canada?

The math is simple. In this country, we buy 1.8 million vehicles a year, and we only make 1.3 million vehicles a year. If we would all commit, with the leadership of a Prime Minister living up to his promise, to buy the vehicles that we make, it would help those families that are worried about their jobs and about buying presents for their kids this Christmas.

Number six is to get rid of the industrial carbon tax. It makes no sense. Let me explain something very simple: Global warming is a global problem. When we put in taxes that drive manufacturing down south, where gas-powered vehicles are made that could have been made in Canada, it does not reduce carbon emissions globally. It is a nonsense policy, and the Liberals should get rid of it today.

I look forward to the Liberals explaining to the House, and to all Canadians, why they will not take these concrete actions, which, by and large, they promised in their platform. Why will they not take them tonight?

• (2225)

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, there are several things.

Perhaps we should start with the fact that 90% of automobiles made in Canada are sold in the United States. Therefore, the key to this whole thing is to continue to have access to the U.S. market. There are other issues, but the fundamental issue is access to the United States market. That access is threatened by U.S. tariffs and the U.S. desire to block the entry of Canadian vehicles into the U.S.

Does the hon. member believe that, just by caving in to U.S. demands and signing any deal, it will solve the problem?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Chair, I respect the honourable gentleman very much. I am very concerned that he did not listen to a word of my speech. We are in a trade war. I am asking the government to fight the trade war, to take actions on the trade war. We do not win a war by lying down and going to sleep. We do not win a trade war by going to the Oval Office and promising the President \$1 trillion of Canadian investment for nothing, and then nodding meekly and saying nothing when he promises to rob us of every single Canadian auto job. That is not winning a trade war. That is not what the Liberals ran on. That is not what they promised. I am asking them to take action.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Chair, a few minutes ago, one of the members opposite asked my colleague here if he had mentioned to the auto workers who have lost their jobs that the government has set aside some money for them and if he had mentioned to them that the government has extended EI in response to the 3,000 lost jobs. It seems to me that the Liberal government's response to everything is to spend more money, throw money at a problem instead of looking at the core issues.

I wonder if my colleague might comment on that.

• (2230)

Matt Strauss: Mr. Chair, Canadians do not want handouts when they lose their jobs; they want their jobs back. The Liberal solution to every single problem is to take tax money and then throw it at the wall. We want our jobs back. We want to work. We do not want EI. It is the opposite of what the Liberals ran on. It is the opposite of what the Prime Minister promised. After 10 years, it is still not going to work.

Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my colleague talked about some of the meetings he has had and the discussions he has had, and I am wondering if in those meetings he met with the Global Automakers of Canada, or the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, or the Automotive Industries Association of Canada, all of which have been supportive of the actions our government has taken toward protecting the jobs in this industry as well as the manufacturers. In fact, Global Automakers of Canada has stated that, with the work the government is undertaking, they are very encouraged by the response.

Has he met with some of these large groups?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Chair, I am a simple physician from Kitchener, Ontario. I grew up in Hespeler. I represent the people of Kitchener and Hespeler, and I care about the jobs in Kitchener South—Hespeler and the Toyota plant there. All of my effort is on that plant. There are many members on this side who have met with all of those groups. Those lobby groups know not to bite the hand that feeds them. They are still working on the Liberals, begging them to take appropriate action, so, no, they are not going to come out and condemn the Liberals while they are in that situation. It is up to us to be bad cop.

Fred Davies: Mr. Chair, I would just like to follow up quickly with the hon. member. It seems we are in this sort of economic purgatory right now with the government. I wonder what his thoughts are on the lack of a national industrial strategy. We have seen so much stuff in this budget, so much money being wasted, so much money being spent.

I wonder what the member sees as the core issues facing Canada today in this sector.

Matt Strauss: Mr. Chair, that is a big question for one minute. The major problem is 10 years of failed Liberal policies that have put us in such a weak position where somebody might want to have a trade war with us. We have more resources per capita than any other country. We have the space. We have the people. We have to let them get to work and get bureaucracy out of the way. The Prime Minister and his budget have been building that bureaucracy.

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Chair, Canada's auto industry has long been a proud cornerstone of our economy. It contributes over \$16 billion to our GDP annually and supports more than 600,000 direct and indirect jobs nationwide, but today, that foundation is cracking.

For decades, Canada's auto sector has relied on a highly integrated North American supply chain dependent on just-in-time delivery and seamless cross-border co-operation, but what was once considered a strength has now been exposed as a dangerous vulnerability. Donald Trump's trade war is seriously damaging the Canadian auto industry, and our workers and communities are paying the price.

Earlier this year, the Trump administration imposed 25% tariffs on Canadian-made vehicles and parts, along with duties on steel and aluminum. Let us be very clear that these actions are totally unjustified and wrong. They violate every principle of fair trade and good international relations. They are a cold, self-interested calculation by the American President, intended to move jobs and production from Canada to the United States. These measures have driven up production costs, disrupted supply chains and eroded our position in the U.S. market, where more than 90% of Canadian auto exports are sold.

The consequences of our dependence on this single market have been devastating. In recent months, Canada has lost tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs, with Ontario seeing the greatest impact. Manufacturing employment as a share of Ontario's total workforce has now fallen below 10% for the first time since records began in 1976. This has negatively affected companies involved in direct automotive production, as well as those who indirectly support this critical industry.

Here are some notable examples. Stellantis recently announced plans to end production at its Brampton assembly plant and shipped 3,000 Canadian jobs to Illinois. In Windsor, Stellantis idled its assembly plant in April, laying off 4,500 employees and threatening up to 12,000 jobs in the auto parts supply chain. It was shocking to hear news of this betrayal.

The federal Liberal government paid Stellantis more than \$220 million to upgrade its plants before this decision was announced, and another \$15 billion in production subsidies were provided to Stellantis in exchange for an explicit commitment to manufacture in Canada.

This has become a disturbing pattern under the Liberal government. Just this week, Algoma Steel issued layoff notices to 1,000 workers after the Liberals gave it \$400 million. Shockingly, according to Algoma's CEO, the federal government knew about these layoff plans before delivering the public funds. General Motors has also delivered a series of blows. The company plans to lay off 2,000 workers at its Oshawa plant this January. This comes after GM announced that it was pausing production at its assembly plant in Ingersoll, Ontario, putting more than 1,000 jobs at risk. Unifor Local 88 has taken the courageous position of vowing to take over the Ingersoll plant if the company attempts to remove equipment from the building.

The present Liberal government was elected largely on its promise to take an elbows-up approach to dealing with the United

Government Orders

States. It marketed its Prime Minister as one who was able to handle Donald Trump. His economist background was touted to be just what Canada needed to protect and advance our economy, yet what have we seen to date? We have seen the Prime Minister make a series of unilateral concessions to the U.S. without securing a single gain for Canada. We have seen the Liberals remove retaliatory tariffs on the U.S. after promising Canadians we would match American tariffs one for one. In the last few months alone, we have seen \$500 million of taxpayer money thrown away to companies who turned around and cut thousands of Canadian jobs. Worse still, the Liberals advanced these funds knowing the companies were going to slash Canadians' employment just before Christmas.

● (2235)

Workers should never be forced to physically occupy their workplace to protect equipment that Canadian taxpayers helped pay for. Canada should never have to bow down to aggressive American actions that are unfair and unjustified. Precious tax dollars should never be wasted on companies without a solid guarantee that this investment will create solid returns and jobs for Canadians and their families. Instead the federal government should do what New Democrats have long called for and stop these companies from taking our money and shipping the equipment we funded out the door.

The reality is that Canada must now take bold action to reclaim control over our auto industry. That means revisiting the principles of the auto pact, which for decades required automakers to produce at least one vehicle in Canada for every one sold here. In our view, any company that wants access to the Canadian market should be required to produce here, no matter where they are headquartered. Whether it is an American, European, Japanese, Korean or Chinese company, if it wants to sell in Canada, it must invest in Canada.

The original auto pact created thousands of jobs and made Canada a global auto leader. A modern auto pact would protect Canadian jobs, innovation and sovereignty in a sector that is vital to our future. It is important to note that it was Conservative and then Liberal policies in the late 1980s and 1990s that put Canada in this vulnerable position with the U.S. today. Those parties decided to more deeply integrate the Canadian economy with the American economy and then with the Mexican one, when the New Democrats warned that this was the wrong course of action.

Government Orders

It was the NDP that said then that while the Canada-U.S. trading relationship was profoundly important, we should be doing everything we can to reduce our dependence on the American market, to diversify our trade and to produce more in Canada to make our economy stronger and more self-sufficient. As a wise merchant told me in Vancouver, it is a vulnerable business that relies too heavily on one customer.

It is clear that those parties, whose poor economic planning got us into the serious economic precarity we are in today, will not be capable of getting us out of it. What we need is what the NDP called for in the late 1980s: a strong policy of economic nationalization, in which we use Canadian companies, using and adding value to Canadian resources and employing Canadian workers to build here and export to the world, just like the U.S. did to achieve its economic strength.

The Liberal government's present lack of leadership has only deepened the crisis. By its weak and ineffective response to Donald Trump, we have emboldened the U.S., and we are seeing the job losses and industrial challenges here as a result. This must be addressed and reversed immediately. We can start by saying that every vehicle sold in Canada must be matched by a vehicle produced here, as we did so successfully with the auto pact. There should be no more vehicles going across the border 12 times before being finished. Let us produce, fabricate and assemble the vehicles here as much as we can.

We must also think forward and build the vehicles of the future. By recently reversing Canada's electric vehicle mandate, the Liberal government has left the Canadian auto industry in limbo and confusion. Businesses need certainty in order to invest, yet this reversal means that Canada will be eclipsed by competitors in the race to the future. While the rest of the world is building EV supply chains, securing battery production and creating sustainable jobs, Canada is betting regressively on 20th-century technology and production like pipelines, fossil fuels and internal combustion engines.

Rather than appeasing the oil and gas sector, Canada must develop resilient supply chains for EV manufacturing, diversify its trade partners and reduce our dependence on the U.S. market once and for all. If we fail to act, we will lose not just community-sustaining jobs but an entire generation of industrial leadership. Canada cannot afford to be at the mercy of any foreign government or corporation.

Donald Trump has been clear that he wants to hurt our economy by shifting production from Canada to the U.S. We cannot let that happen. Instead of capitulation to the Trump administration, we need decisive action to protect jobs, strengthen our auto industry and build an economy that works for all—

• (2240)

The Chair: Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Chair, there are many issues that we share. If we discussed things, we could possibly get to some understanding. I do not agree, obviously, with everything that was said, but I do thank my colleague for mentioning that, for example, the tariffs on steel and aluminum are one of the largest contributors to the recent in-

crease in the cost of production of automobiles in the United States and Canada.

I also would caution all colleagues here that the Stellantis story is not finished yet, so let us not jump to conclusions right away. There is more to come on that.

With respect to the issue of diversifying trade, clearly we need to do that. How do we accomplish that? How do we accomplish diversifying trade in the auto industry when, as we all know, exporting Canadian vehicles to other continents is somewhat complicated?

Don Davies: Well, Mr. Chair, it is said that when one is in a hole, the first thing one should do is stop digging. We did not just wake up today with this kind of vulnerability in the auto sector. This is the result of policy failures by successive Liberal and Conservative governments over several decades. I was talking to a colleague earlier, from the Conservative Party, who told me that he remembers when there were tens of thousands of workers in Ontario running three shifts in a row, 24 hours a day, producing massive numbers of vehicles, and now there are hundreds of them who are walking into empty factories. That did not just happen.

What we need is a reinvigorated, robust commitment to investing in Canada. We have to stop doing what we have done for the last 40 years, which is simply to try to integrate our economy more deeply into the American one. We have to have faith in our own country. Let us invest here. Let us build our vehicles here. Let us export to other countries in the world, and let us reduce our dependency on the United States.

There will be some economic pain and adjustment to that, absolutely, but what have we learned in the last several years? We have learned that the Americans are no longer a trustworthy partner. The Prime Minister says that himself. We would be foolhardy to continue to try to repair a damaged relationship. Let us bet on Canada. Let us get more self-sufficient, build the vehicles of the future here and export them all over the world.

• (2245)

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Chair, my colleague's comments build on the weekend comments that he made. He has become a social media star, I would suggest, and it is great that he is doing that. They were great comments with regard to your concerns about this government's actions going from elbows up to, "Who cares?" Your notions about providing—

The Chair: I have to interrupt the member. It is through the Chair. The Chair does not know what notions the member is speaking of.

Government Orders

I will invite the member to continue.

Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Chair, the member indicated in his remarks that \$220 million had gone to Stellantis and \$400 million had gone to Algoma, and no guardrails were put in place for those dollars to flow.

What does the member think are their main concerns? Why has the government been unable to get an agreement with the United States? It has been 10 years with regard to softwood lumber. Why is the government failing so badly in its negotiations with the United States?

Don Davies: Mr. Chair, that is an excellent question. There are probably a number of factors that go into that. I think the fundamental flaw was a decision made in the late 1980s, where it was decided that we would more closely integrate the Canadian economy into the United States' economy.

At that time, again, as I said, New Democrats felt that this was the wrong course of action. Although, obviously, our long border, our geographic proximity and all of those various factors mean we are always going to be very close trading partners with our partners to the south, to the extent possible, we needed the government to be pivoting our economy away from the United States, just in case a moment like today ever occurred. I think it was naive beyond belief in the 1980s and 1990s to think that the United States would always be benevolent and that they would always subordinate their interests to Canada's. I think we are learning that this is not the case. Donald Trump's "put America first" policy means that Canadians are second. What we have to do now is correct that.

Why the government fails to recognize that is beyond me, but unfortunately, Canadian workers and Canadian communities are paying the price for that lack of foresight now. The question for Canadians is, what do we do now? Let us invest in our country now. Let us not make the same mistake. Let us become more self-sufficient, get more value from our raw resources, build more things here, diversify our trade relationships and make Canada a stronger, independent, sovereign economy like we should have done 40 years ago.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the member for Vancouver Kingsway is talking down our current policies. Apparently, he voted no to budget 2025, so he is not supporting our plans.

How does the NDP plan to respond concretely to U.S. tariffs? What is its plan?

Don Davies: Mr. Chair, we are not the government. The real question should be reversed. How does the government plan to respond to U.S. tariffs? I will tell members one thing. What the Liberals should do is honour the promises they made Canadians during the election campaign, which was that they would stand up to Donald Trump, elbows up, that they would have a robust position where they would match American tariffs one for one and that they would retaliate. That is why Canadians put their faith in the Liberal Party and the Prime Minister.

What have they seen in the last six months? They have seen unilateral concession after unilateral concession, getting nothing in return. That is not what Canadians expected from the government, and it is not the tariff policy that we need. We need a strong, robust,

brave, courageous policy like the New Democrats are putting forth in the House.

• (2250)

Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Chair, would the hon. member not agree that there could possibly be other policies implemented by the government that have caused crises in the auto sector, for example, the lack of an industrial carbon tax in the United States and the lack of an EV mandate in the United States? The sector is telling all politicians here in the House that no one is going to be able to meet those EV targets and mandates. Why does the government continue to foist this on them, which is only going to make them less competitive?

Does the hon. member think there are steps the government can take to assist the auto sector now as well as with the tariff relief that it seeks?

Don Davies: Mr. Chair, I very much respect my hon. colleague's perspective and experience, but I am afraid that I would have to respectfully disagree with him on a couple of points. One is that I do think the future of the auto sector is one that is going to pivot away from the internal combustion engine. I think that the most far-sighted, intelligent economies of the world will be making those investments now to build the cars of the future, not the cars of the past.

Again, I have heard time and time again from businesses over my time as an elected MP that what businesses need is certainty. They can respond to different policies but they need certainty. This lurching change in EV policy has confused the industry. I think it is bad for the environment, bad for the climate and bad for investment in this country when the government alters its position.

By the way, it is very different from what the Liberals said during the election campaign as well, which I think contributes to a sense of political cynicism in this country when voters think they are voting for one thing and they get another.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Chair, I wonder if the member could comment on that uncertainty a bit more. That uncertainty, according to the auto manufacturers and the auto workers I have talked to, is because of the EV mandate and the fact that we have policies at home that are hurting us.

Would the member agree that these policies are hurting our auto workers and that the Liberals right now could do something about that?

Don Davies: Mr. Chair, what I would just mention is this. One thing I have heard in this House for years is that the federal government is going to take the lead on building a nationwide system of EV charging stations. It is true that we have to build the infrastructure to support the transition to those vehicles.

The Liberals have never done that, and that is a serious problem. We need a serious government that is going to take this issue seriously. The Liberal—

Government Orders

The Chair: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Niagara South.

The member will be cut off at 11 o'clock, so he has about six and a half minutes.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Chair, I am honoured to wrap this debate up tonight.

Coming from the Niagara region, which was literally built on the auto sector, I am grateful that my friend from Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake is here tonight to contribute to this debate. As I mentioned earlier, he worked at GM while he was going to university, as did many of my friends and many of my colleagues. I grew up in the small town of Port Colborne, and the ambition of a lot of people who grew up in my town was to get a job at GM or Ford, because it was a well-paid job with good benefits, a future and stability that would enable them to raise their family and enjoy their life.

A friend of mine, Alan Davis, who will probably be upset with me for saying this, recently said to me in Port Colborne that he was so grateful to have had the job he had for so many years. They closed the plant in St. Catharines early in his career, but every day, a group of people from St. Catharines and the Niagara region would take a bus from Niagara to Oshawa, so that they could finish their career and have a solid pension. It was a hardship for them to do that, but they did it, and he says that he is forever grateful for the job and the opportunity he had to work for that company. However, those jobs have disappeared over the years.

For a little perspective, as I said earlier, Niagara was a hub for the automotive sector. In 1969, 47% of all the jobs in Niagara were in the auto sector. Almost one in two jobs in Niagara was in the auto sector. In 2008, that number was reduced to 4,000. By 2014, it further decreased to about 2,900 but still represented about \$2.5 billion of economic impact for the Niagara region. Today, as I think my colleague for Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake said, there are only 700 direct jobs in the auto sector left in Niagara, so we went from 18,000 jobs in Niagara down to about 700 today.

The Ford glass plant has disappeared and closed. The GM engine plant is gone, as is the GM foundry. I used to be in the homebuilding business in the 1980s, and I remember building a first house for an individual. It was a brand new house for him. He had just recently retired from the foundry, and had learned before his last day that the foundry was closing forever.

I am in a situation today where I have two EV plants in my riding. One was built about two or three years ago. It was for Linamar, which built a plant in Welland to support the Ford F-150. It was go-

ing to be providing parts that would support the EV side of the Ford F-150 in Canada. However, that plant never opened. It sits about a mile and a half from where I live. It is a beautiful turnkey plant, if anyone is interested in buying it. It is on the market.

This is an example of what a Yale professor refers to as narrative economics. The government created an economic environment based on a narrative that did not have a solid foundation under it, which is the danger when governments get into the idea of narrative economics: They create something that does not exist. In this case, the company put up over \$1 billion to build a plant on the basis of an economic strategy and narrative that just never materialized.

Canada is not in a position today, on any level, to support the EV sector. The EV mandate, while seemingly logical at the time, has turned out to be completely illogical, because not only are Canadians not interested in buying EV vehicles in the capacity that the government had, in its narrative, created, but we do not have the infrastructure to support that EV mandate.

● (2255)

The sooner the government gets rid of that mandate, the better off the narrative in the economy will be because it will give some certainty within the economy for companies to plan, including in the auto sector. That needs to happen.

The other plant in my riding is in my hometown of Port Colborne. It is the Asahi Kasei plant, which is an ion battery separator plant. It has been touted as the largest single industrial investment in the Niagara region. It is still under construction, and there is still a lot of uncertainty in the market. Hopefully, in this instance, because it is not manufacturing automobiles, it can pivot.

Asahi Kasei is one of the largest manufacturing companies in the world. It manufactures a large number of different products from Japan. I am hopeful that at least this company will be able to pivot in the event that the narrative does not happen and the economy does not support that kind of investment in the sector.

During the summer, I had the opportunity to sit down for lunch with the American ambassador to Canada—

● (2300)

The Chair: It being 11 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, December 2, the committee will rise.

(Government Business No. 3 reported)

The Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 3, 2025

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Men of the Deeps	
Kelloway	4519
Gordie Howe International Bridge	
Gill (Windsor West)	4519
North York General Hospital Seniors' Health Centre	
Chi	4519
Christmas	
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	4520
Graduation Rates	
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	4520
Christmas	
Falk (Provencher)	4520
Ukraine	
Bardeesy	4520
Athletic Achievement	
Konanz	4520
Tremblant World Cup	
Gaudreau	4521
Public Safety	
Dhaliwal	4521
Softwood Lumber	
Kibble	4521
Ecumenical Council Anniversary	
Koutrakis	4521
Liberal Party of Canada	
Généreux	4521
Victoria Mboko	
Ntumba	4522
Housing	
Jansen	4522
International Day of Persons with Disabilities	
Church	4522

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy	
Poilievre	4522
Carney	4522
Poilievre	4522
Carney	4523
Poilievre	4523
Carney	4523
Poilievre	4523
Carney	4523

Steel and Aluminum Industry	
Poilievre	4523
Carney	4523
Poilievre	4523
Carney	4523
Canadian Identity and Culture	
Blanchet	4523
Carney	4524
Climate Change	
Blanchet	4524
Carney	4524
Blanchet	4524
Carney	4524
Automotive Industry	
Poilievre	4524
The Speaker	4524
Poilievre	4524
Champagne	4524
Poilievre	4524
Champagne	4524
Poilievre	4525
Joly	4525
Poilievre	4525
Joly	4525
Poilievre	4525
Joly	4525
Forestry Industry	
Poilievre	4525
Hodgson	4525
Natural Resources	
Bonin	4526
Dabrusin	4526
Bonin	4526
Miller	4526
Official Languages	
Paul-Hus	4526
Miller	4526
Paul-Hus	4526
MacKinnon	4526
Steel and Aluminum Industry	
Lantsman	4526
Hajdu	4526
Lantsman	4527
Hajdu	4527
Kuruc	4527
Joly	4527
Sport	
Auguste	4527
van Koeverden	4527

Automotive Industry	
Seeback	4527
Sidhu (Brampton East)	4527
Seeback	4528
McGuinty	4528
Block	4528
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	4528

Forestry Industry	
Strahl	4528
Hodgson	4528
Gunn	4528
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	4528
Kronis	4528
McKnight	4529

Natural Resources	
Calkins	4529
Hodgson	4529
Calkins	4529
MacKinnon	4529
Morin	4529
Battiste	4529

Aerospace Industry	
Watchorn	4529
Champagne	4529

Housing	
Mantle	4530
Robertson	4530
Mantle	4530
Robertson	4530
Deltell	4530
Lightbound	4530

Justice	
Dhillon	4530
Sahota	4531

Housing	
Groleau	4531
Lightbound	4531

Employment	
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	4531
Hajdu	4531

Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Lamoureux	4531
Albas	4531

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-225. Second reading	4532
Motion agreed to	4533
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	4533

National Strategy on Flood and Drought Forecasting Act	
Bill C-241. Second reading	4533
Motion agreed to	4535
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	4535

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Lamoureux	4535

Interparliamentary Delegations	
Fry	4535

Committees of the House	
Library of Parliament	
Dhaliwal	4535

Foreign Affairs and International Development	
Hussen	4535

Criminal Code	
Fortin	4535
Bill C-258. Introduction and first reading	4535
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	4535

Petitions	
Safe Consumption Site	
Vis	4535

Religious Freedom	
Au	4535

Public Safety	
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	4536

Human Rights in India	
Viersen	4536

Medical Assistance in Dying	
Viersen	4536

Health Care	
May	4536

Questions Passed as Orders for Return	
Lamoureux	4536

Motions for Papers	
Lamoureux	4536

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

An Act to implement the Protocol on the Accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership	
Bill C-13. Second reading	4536
Naqvi	4536
Mantle	4538
Savard-Tremblay	4538
Lamoureux	4538

Johns	4539
Blois	4539
Kronis	4540
Lamoureux	4541
Tolmie	4541
Kronis	4541
Lamoureux	4543
Savard-Tremblay	4543
Bexte	4543
Lamoureux	4545
Savard-Tremblay	4545
Bonk	4545
Tolmie	4546
Blois	4547
Caputo	4547
Lamoureux	4547

Points of Order

Order Paper Questions Nos. 461 and 470

Bragdon	4547
---------------	------

An Act to Implement the Protocol on the Accession of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership

Bill C-13. Second reading	4548
Gallant	4548
Eyolfson	4549
Simard	4550
Calkins	4550
Lamoureux	4550
Sidhu (Brampton East)	4550
Arnold	4552
Savard-Tremblay	4552
Blois	4553
MacDonald (Cardigan)	4553

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Conservation Donations

Villeneuve	4555
Motion	4555
Genuis	4556
Bonin	4556
St-Pierre	4557
Ross	4557
Bonin	4558

Points of Order

Order Paper Questions Nos. 461 and 470

Lamoureux	4560
-----------------	------

Conservation Donations

Motion	4560
Grant	4560
Genuis	4562
Simard	4563

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada's Auto Industry

(House in committee of the whole on Government Business No. 3, John Nater in the chair)	4563
Sidhu (for the Minister of Transport)	4564
Motion	4564
Lamoureux	4564
Dancho	4564
O'Rourke	4564
Bardeesy	4565
Dancho	4566
Lemire	4566
O'Rourke	4566
Dancho	4566
Bardeesy	4567
Lemire	4567
Strauss	4568
Guglielmin	4568
Bardeesy	4569
Savard-Tremblay	4569
Strauss	4570
Savard-Tremblay	4570
Bardeesy	4571
Lewis (Essex)	4571
Fortin	4571
Lemire	4571
Lewis (Essex)	4572
Savard-Tremblay	4573
O'Rourke	4573
Kramp-Neuman	4574
Lemire	4574
Bardeesy	4575
Fortin	4575
Seeback	4576
Lewis (Essex)	4576
Savard-Tremblay	4577
Lewis (Essex)	4577
Gill (Windsor West)	4577
Ramsay	4578
Lemire	4578
Lewis (Essex)	4578
Grant	4579
Davidson	4579
Lemire	4580
Ramsay	4580
Bittle	4580
Davidson	4581
Lemire	4581
Ramsay	4581
Khanna	4582
Gill (Windsor West)	4582
Lemire	4583
Gill (Windsor West)	4583
Kirkland	4583
Gill (Windsor West)	4584
Leitão	4584
Gill (Windsor West)	4584

Lapointe (Sudbury).....	4584	Kramp-Neuman.....	4592
Acan.....	4585	Leitão.....	4592
Davies (Niagara South).....	4585	O'Rourke.....	4593
Auguste.....	4586	Ramsay.....	4593
Gill (Windsor West).....	4586	Kramp-Neuman.....	4593
O'Rourke.....	4586	Gill (Brampton West).....	4594
Lapointe (Sudbury).....	4586	Leitão.....	4594
Davies (Niagara South).....	4587	Davies (Niagara South).....	4594
O'Rourke.....	4588	O'Rourke.....	4595
Davidson.....	4588	Strauss.....	4595
Lamoureux.....	4589	Leitão.....	4596
Kirkland.....	4589	Davies (Niagara South).....	4596
O'Rourke.....	4589	Lapointe (Sudbury).....	4596
Baldinelli.....	4589	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway).....	4597
Leitão.....	4590	Leitão.....	4598
Kirkland.....	4590	Baldinelli.....	4598
Deschênes-Thériault.....	4591	Acan.....	4599
Deschênes-Thériault.....	4591	Kirkland.....	4599
Kramp-Neuman.....	4592	Davies (Niagara South).....	4600
Ramsay.....	4592	(Government Business No. 3 reported).....	4600

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>