



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 017

Thursday, November 27, 2025

Chair: Angelo Iacono



Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, November 27, 2025

• (1100)

[*English*]

The Chair (Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.)): Good day, colleagues.

This is meeting number 17 of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

This meeting is taking place in a hybrid format and is in public. We have witness testimony for one hour, followed by committee business in camera.

For those in person, please follow the health and safety guidelines on the cards that are found on the table to prevent audio feedback incidents for the translators.

Also, while you are speaking, when you see this card go up, it indicates that you have one more minute left to express all your comments. When I turn it over, it means please end your sentence ASAP, or else I will have to cut you off.

[*Translation*]

The committee is resuming its study of the electric vehicle availability standard.

[*English*]

This morning we are meeting with the following witnesses: from Canadian Automobile Dealers Association, Tim Reuss and Charles Bernard; from Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, Brian Kingston; and from the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, Jerome Gesaroli.

You each have five minutes for opening remarks.

We will start with Mr. Tim Reuss.

Tim Reuss (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Automobile Dealers Association): Good morning.

The Canadian Automobile Dealers Association represents 3,400 franchised new car and truck dealers across Canada that directly employ over 178,000 people, contribute \$28 billion to Canada's GDP and pay over \$6 billion in federal, provincial and municipal taxes. This year, our members will sell over 1.9 million new vehicles, 1.3 million used vehicles and write 31 million repair orders.

Our members have collectively invested over \$3.4 billion in the EV transition, but the current mandated pace of the EV transition is not in line with consumer demands or Canada's logistical challenges.

When the electric vehicle availability standard was introduced, the federal government made a number of statements and commitments specifically related to affordability that are not valid anymore:

...consumer purchases of ZEVs will be supported by \$2 billion invested by the Government of Canada in the Incentive for Zero Emissions Vehicle Program (iZEV).

That support was initially paused and now has been officially cancelled. The mandated targets were improbable to begin with due to weak consumer demand, technology limitations across vehicle segments and use cases, as well as infrastructure shortfalls. Removing the purchase incentives moved these targets from improbable to impossible.

The Prime Minister and cabinet's decision to pause the 2026 mandates was a very good first step. We appreciate the many opposition and government MPs who have raised this issue as a concern for consumers and for the country.

Now is the time to take the next step and remove these unnecessary mandates altogether. Other existing federal-level regulations will reduce emissions without dictating technology. The Prime Minister has correctly labelled this time a historic trade rupture. In the spirit of all sides coming to the table during this crisis, we make the following suggestions for progress.

Suspend the EV mandate until the future of Canada's auto industry is clearer, based on the outcomes of the negotiations between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico regarding tariffs and a new CUSMA or USMCA.

The federal government should work collaboratively with industry on a revised trajectory for targeted, technology-neutral zero-emission vehicle sales to align with consumer preferences and the actual availability of charging options.

Count all hybrid vehicles, not just plug-in hybrids, towards any new targets.

Exclude EVs and all hybrids from the so-called luxury tax.

Implement a mechanism to prevent automotive companies with no significant manufacturing or dealer footprint investment and employment in Canada, such as Tesla and Rivian, from profiting from the sale of their excess credits.

Last, the federal government should work with B.C. and Quebec to have one framework, not three separate and distinct ones in Canada.

Our chief economist will now provide some data perspectives.

Charles.

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

Charles Bernard (Chief Economist, Canadian Automobile Dealers Association): Thank you, Mr. Reuss.

I wish to thank the committee for their invitation.

My name is Charles Bernard, and I am the chief economist of the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association, CADA.

I think the situation is quite clear. Dealers remain actively committed to providing services and products that enable consumers to purchase and maintain electric vehicles.

The challenge with a vehicle supply that is subject to a standard and which is growing rapidly is that by definition, it is not pegged to the level of demand for electric vehicles. Dealers are currently operating in an environment where demand is not aligned with the pace imposed by mandatory targets.

The numbers are interesting. For example, a look at the most recent data for the second quarter of 2025 shows a positive trend in terms of the uptake of electric vehicles. These figures are 4% in Halifax, 17% in Vancouver and 5% in Winnipeg. The figures for Joliette soar to 16%. I didn't have the numbers for Repentigny, and so I used the number for a nearby community.

Although this is a positive trend facilitated by dealers, it falls short of the federal mandate. The disparity between the mandated targets and the actual market trajectory is likely to have a negative impact that outweighs the intended benefits of the regulation.

All this comes at the worst time, when prices are going up and accessibility is declining due to tariffs.

In our opinion, the time has come to review the viability of the standard, identify a new approach suited to the current environment based on data and facts from consumers and dealerships, rather than getting bogged down in political positions.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Reuss and Mr. Bernard.

Mr. Kingston, you have the floor for five minutes.

[*English*]

Brian Kingston (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association): Mr. Chair and committee members, thank you for the invitation to appear today as part of your study of the electric vehicle availability standard, the EVAS.

The members of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association are committed to electrification. In fact, they are leading the transition to electric in Canada. Ford and General Motors are the zero-emission vehicles sales-market leaders through the second quarter of this year. Stellantis is the only automaker in Canada manufacturing batteries and assembling a light-duty zero-emission vehicle.

Over the past decade, the number of zero-emission vehicles available for sale to Canadians has increased by 400%. Today, there are 115 models on the market in every size and segment to meet the transportation needs of all Canadians. Despite these investments into electrification, ZEV sales have collapsed. There were 17,192 new ZEVs sold in September 2025. That's a decrease of 43.3% from the same month the previous year. It should be clear to everyone now that federally mandated ZEV sales targets established in the EVAS are unrealistic and unachievable. To meet the 23% sales target for 2027, ZEV sales would need to increase by 256% immediately. Achieving 60% ZEV sales by the 2030 model year is even more unrealistic. It would require a compound annual growth rate of over 48%.

We recommend that the government fully repeal the EVAS and instead focus on building out the supports that Canadians need to go electric. This includes incentives for Canadians to purchase ZEVs and a rapid build-out of charging infrastructure. According to the federal government's own numbers as of October 2025, there are only 37,000 public charging ports in operation. That is far short of the 100,000 needed this year and the 410,000 required by 2035. To support this charging infrastructure, Canada needs to invest in clean electricity generation and grid capacity. NRCan estimates that the grid upgrades required to meet ZEV demand, including generation, transmission and distribution, will cost up to \$294 billion over the next 15 years.

Repealing the EVAS does not jeopardize Canada's emissions reduction goals. The EVAS duplicates our existing greenhouse gas emission standards, adding an unnecessary burden without any additional environmental benefit. Canada's GHG emission regulations have already driven significant reductions in vehicle emissions—49.8% for passenger cars and 30.7% for light trucks since 2011. These are outcomes-based, technology-neutral standards that are far superior to the EVAS. They provide flexibility. They support innovation, and they do not distort the market. Persisting with the expensive, duplicative and ineffective EVAS risks inflicting lasting harm on automakers at precisely the wrong moment.

Automakers are under intense pressure due to tariffs and trade disruptions that put the sector and the hundreds of thousands of jobs it supports at risk. To comply with this regulation, automakers are forced to restrict sales of internal combustion engine vehicles and to purchase credits from foreign manufacturers that do not build cars in Canada. If the regulation is not repealed, automakers will have to remove between 700,000 and 900,000 gas-powered and fuel-efficient hybrid vehicle sales from this market starting this year, and they will have to purchase over \$3 billion in compliance credits. Of the 1.3 million vehicles built in Canada last year, 95% will be prohibited for sale in this country because of the EVAS. This would be devastating for the auto industry, dealerships and the Canadian economy.

Canadians will ultimately bear the brunt of this regulation in the form of job losses, higher vehicle prices and less availability as vehicle restrictions limit inventories. According to Environment Canada's own assessment of the regulation, the EVAS will have a disproportionate impact on low-income Canadians, rural Canadians and northern communities that are going to face higher vehicle prices and have limited access to charging infrastructure. That is in Environment Canada's own assessment of this regulation.

As the Prime Minister has said, "In the face of a changing global landscape, we [must focus] on what we can control". Repealing the EVAS is the most effective way to protect this critical industry and ensure that Canadians are spared from the damaging effects of this regulation.

Thank you.

• (1110)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kingston.

The floor is yours for five minutes, Mr. Gessaroli.

Jerome Gessaroli (Senior Fellow, Macdonald-Laurier Institute): Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee, for the opportunity to speak today.

I want to address a central challenge facing Canada's electric vehicle availability standard, which is the trade-off between speeding up zero-emission vehicle adoption and creating uneven costs for households in regions.

No one disputes the importance of lowering transportation emissions, but the pace the EVAS imposes can create affordability pressures. To be effective, the transition must work for all households. The concerns I highlight cover income, access and region.

Number one is that EV mandates can raise costs for families with limited means. Mandates require automakers to sell a fixed share of EVs, even when consumer demand lags. Manufacturers may respond by reducing the supply of lower-priced gas models, which drives up prices for gas vehicles. This raises the costs for drivers who cannot yet switch to an EV.

We often hear that the average EV price will soon match gas vehicle prices, but this comparison is misleading. Lower-income families typically shop below the average price point, putting EVs out of reach. Moreover, higher new vehicle prices spill into the used vehicle market, where most lower-income families buy cars. As used vehicle prices rise, many households will keep older, higher-emitting vehicles longer.

Number two is that EV benefits are not yet shared evenly across income groups. EVs offer lower operating costs, especially for drivers with home charging, but access to those savings is very uneven. Higher-income households are more likely to buy new EVs and have a garage or driveway for charging. Renters and lower-income families often lack both home charging and affordable credit.

In B.C., electricity for home charging costs less than eight cents per kilowatt hour, while public fast charging costs roughly four to eight times more. Over 10 years, a renter could pay about \$7,000 more for electricity than a homeowner driving the same distance. Many lower-income households simply cannot afford the upfront cost of financing for a new EV. The Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates that EVs still cost roughly \$7,000 to \$11,500 more than gas vehicles, pricing out the very households that could benefit most from lower operating costs.

Number three is about rural and remote communities. Longer driving distances, cold climates, towing requirements and sparse charging networks all reduce EV practicality in rural and northern regions. Meeting federal goals would require building roughly 98 new public charging ports every day until 2035, highlighting how uneven the rollout could be for communities with the weakest charging access. Mandates also raise prices and reduce the availability of these vehicles that communities rely on, creating regional disparities. Urban areas may see more early benefits from electrification, while rural and remote communities face higher costs and fewer viable options.

Number four is about how the tension is ambition versus affordability. If we push EV adoption faster than consumers, budgets and infrastructure can support it, the uneven impacts will fall most heavily on households with fewer resources, especially renters and rural residents. As it is currently designed, the tension within the EVAS falls too much against affordability, so achieving electrification fairly will require substantial adjustments and a more realistic timeline.

A more balanced approach would include aligning mandates with realistic consumer demand and infrastructure rollout; mandates acting as a guide or a nudge, not compelling automakers into costly adjustments; and focusing on emission outcomes, rather than prescribing technologies. Ultimately, what matters is cutting GHG emissions efficiently. The market can determine the most efficient mix of technologies.

In closing, we all want to reduce GHG emissions, but not at the cost of wider economic divides. Recognizing these impacts is essential to a fair transition.

Thank you.

• (1115)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Gessaroli.

Mr. Bexte, from the Conservative Party, you have the floor for six minutes.

[*English*]

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, witnesses, for being here today, and thank you to the clerks for keeping track of what we do.

Those were very powerful opening statements. I appreciate all of you and what you've contributed here today.

Mr. Kingston, last month this committee heard some pretty powerful testimony from Alberta auto dealer Doug Green. He described the necessary infrastructure investments at the dealership level that were seemingly unrecoverable: inventory that couldn't be sold and shrinking margins with rural customers walking away. We can couple that with his statement that roughly 50% of the vehicles that typical dealerships sell, especially in the prairies and rural areas, are vocational vehicles that impact trade and GDP-generating activities.

How widespread do you think these pressures are across the country with this forced capital spending on infrastructure and the

unsaleable inventory? Can you talk to this rural-urban mismatch and how this manifests?

Brian Kingston: Yes, this is one of the biggest challenges with EV mandates, because you see different uptake levels and demand levels depending on where you are in the country. In urban areas, you'll see dealerships that have significant demand for this. In rural areas, in some instances you'll be lucky if you sell a single EV in a year. This is the problem with trying to force a mandated sales target.

What happens as a manufacturer is that you have to balance this equation among your sales. If you have a dealership in a rural part of Canada where 90% of vehicle sales are combustion engine pickup trucks, for example, when that dealership goes to order its vehicles, it now will be told, "We can't give you that full order. We have to give you electric."

That's even if you have never had someone come through the door saying that they would like to purchase an electric vehicle. The result is that the dealer has to carry that inventory and then eventually end up selling the vehicle at a loss.

If this is truly about inventory, that problem has been solved. There are more models than ever. We just released a survey this morning from Leger, in which we asked Canadians what their biggest barrier is to EV adoption. The last choice they picked—11% of respondents—was inventory challenges. It is a non-factor. If you want an EV, you can find one. You can buy one.

We need to actually focus on helping people make the switch and not forcing them to.

• (1120)

David Bexte: Related to that, you mentioned the credits. Are you aware of any Canadian automakers that have already purchased compliance credits from other car companies internationally?

Brian Kingston: Yes. Automakers have already purchased over \$1 billion in compliance credits to prepare themselves for these targets out to 2030.

David Bexte: Where do those credits go? Do they go out of the country?

Brian Kingston: Presumably, they're being purchased from a foreign automaker.

This is a company in Canada giving money to foreign automakers to comply.

David Bexte: That is flight of capital. That is resource and wealth from this nation that has evaporated and is not available.

Thank you. I appreciate that. Is that Tesla?

A voice: Yes.

David Bexte: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Kingston, you originally supported the EV mandate back in December 2022 and mentioned that your members invested billions of dollars in the technology. Why has your position changed?

Brian Kingston: We've never supported the EV mandate. We've been clear from the get-go. We've always—

David Bexte: I'm sorry.

Mr. Reuss.

Tim Reuss: We as well were supportive of the direction being taken to reduce emissions overall, but we were also very clear from the beginning that this is a regulation layered on top of one that already exists. We already have greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in place over the next couple of years. This is just one added level of complexity that is dictating technology to consumers.

David Bexte: We've heard the Liberals often say that the mandate doesn't restrict consumer choice and that it even increases it. Can you explain a bit more that impact on consumer choice?

Tim Reuss: If you're in a rural area, we have regions in the country where 80% to 90% of the market is pickups. That's the vehicle you need—not the vehicle you want—in order to run your business, your farm and, yes, also to run to the grocery store. Those are the types of vehicles you need.

Initially, EVs were not available in the market. They are now available in the market, but the key pieces, the infrastructure to support those vehicles, is not in place. If you're in a rural area and you now have, yes, an electric pickup that is available, on average you're driving 400 miles. By the way, that mileage is reduced by almost 40% if the temperature is very cold in rural areas. You can no longer use that vehicle for what you need it for. You're left with having to go to an internal combustion engine, even if you would like to have an electric vehicle.

David Bexte: Thank you.

Mr. Gessaroli, could you explain a little bit more and expand on the time value of money? You mentioned the high upfront cost with cheaper operating costs down the road, but how much of a barrier is that to entry, especially for low-income families or families in remote locations?

Jerome Gessaroli: In terms of the time value of money, a dollar today is worth more than a dollar in five years' time. It's also more expensive to buy something today than—

David Bexte: Exactly, so even if there are cost savings over a 10-year period, vehicle ownership value is less than the extra cost to buy the vehicle.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

For six minutes, Mr. Fanjoy, the floor is yours.

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Thank you.

Mr. Reuss, we've talked about how, at present, there is a higher upfront cost that's overcompensated for by a lower total ownership cost over a lifetime. If it was easier, perhaps with the return of an EV subsidy, to make it possible for Canadians to make the switch sooner, would the supply of EVs in Canada be there to meet that demand?

Tim Reuss: Let me start by saying that while operating costs for the individual are less over the life cycle of an electric vehicle, that is in no way enough to overcompensate for, as was said, the initial price difference that still exists in the market between an EV and a vehicle with an internal combustion engine.

The incentives that were in place reduced that gap somewhat, but they have now completely gone away—

• (1125)

Bruce Fanjoy: If I can interject, are you saying that the total cost of ownership of an EV is greater than for a combustion engine vehicle?

Tim Reuss: No. It is lower than for an internal combustion vehicle, but that amount, that life cycle cost that's lower does not overcompensate for the upfront difference in the price, meaning that if there is a price gap of \$10,000, your life cycle cost difference might only be \$1,000 or \$2,000.

Bruce Fanjoy: However, you would agree that over the lifetime of the vehicle, a consumer would pay less for an EV.

Tim Reuss: That depends on what he is paying up front as the price.

Bruce Fanjoy: Okay.

It also depends on the distance that people drive, because the farther you drive, the greater the benefit from lower operating costs. Could you explain to me how, when people drive longer distances in rural parts of the country, that would not benefit rural Canadians?

Tim Reuss: The problem for them is that they can't make that long trip because the charging infrastructure is not there for them to complete the trip. The sparse charging infrastructure currently in place unfortunately is not functional a lot of times. You might start out on a trip of 400 kilometres, assuming that there is a charging station at 200 kilometres that you can stop at for 40 minutes and have a Tim Hortons and then keep driving on, but when you get there, all of a sudden that charging station is not working.

By the way, you have to stop for 45 minutes, not the five minutes needed to gas up.

Bruce Fanjoy: In the majority of cases, and I would venture the vast majority of cases, even in rural parts of the country—I live in and represent one myself—people are driving for everyday needs. I realize there are extreme cases in which you might have to drive farther, but usually it's every day, and you return home at night or at the end of the day and you can charge at home.

Why would that not be beneficial for people? Why would we not want rural Canadians to save money with an electric vehicle?

Tim Reuss: It's not that we're saying we don't want them to save money. What we are saying is that the infrastructure is not there to support that use case of those electric vehicles in those areas.

There is, however, a very good use case for other technologies, such as hybrids, that are already coming into the market. However, we're not accounting for them strongly enough in any targets or regulations that we're putting in place—hence our concrete proposal to include all types of hybrids, not just plug-ins, in any adjustments that are made.

Bruce Fanjoy: Mr. Bernard, you're an economist. Economic history is littered with industries and companies that failed to adapt fast enough to new and superior technology.

What would you foresee being the impacts on the Canadian automotive industry—we all can agree we want to maintain a strong industry here in Canada—of moving too slowly in the face of shifting technology and market demand?

Charles Bernard: Thank you for your question. I think it's pertinent.

I would also say that the study of economic history is rooted in data, and the history of the data of the EV market is that it's not moving too slowly. It's quite the opposite. The supply side of the equation, which the EVAS is about, is following a trend that's meeting what the market is demanding. The data is proving that if that EVAS curve goes too fast for the demand curve, that gap is going to generate negative effects that are not related to technology that's going too slow or too fast. I think they're more related to a policy that might have been adequate for a context, and in a new context, it doesn't make any sense to go further.

That would be my economic history take.

Bruce Fanjoy: Are you familiar with the global market where EV adoption is the fastest in the world?

Charles Bernard: Yes.

Bruce Fanjoy: Is that Norway?

Charles Bernard: It is Norway, yes.

Bruce Fanjoy: Is Norway a tropical country or is it a northern country?

Charles Bernard: It's a fair argument. The thing about Norway is it never put in a mandate. They didn't choose the technology. They made it very enticing to choose one, and that's on the demand side of the equation, which, once again, is not the goal of the EVAS.

It's also a centralized country where there was no difference between what it was doing—

• (1130)

The Chair: The time is up.

Charles Bernard: I'm sorry.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bernard.

Mr. Bonin, you have the floor for six minutes.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you for being here.

Mr. Kingston, you said that billions of dollars were paid to Tesla to buy credits. Is that what you said?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: Yes, that's right. The way it works is if a company can't meet the mandated target that the EVAS has established, you have to buy credits, so yes, it's billions.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I know how it works. I just wanted to confirm that you spoke about billions of dollars.

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Do you have any proof that Canadian manufacturers purchased credits worth billions of dollars from Tesla?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: I actually have it right here. The publicly available quarterly reporting from this company in Q3 of 2025 was \$417 million U.S., and in Q2 it was \$439 million U.S.—

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Is this in Canada?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: This is North American regulatory credits, so this would be a mix of California and Canada. It is \$11 billion U.S. over the past decade and—

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: You're saying that Canadian companies paid billions of dollars because of the Canadian credit. Is that correct?

[English]

Brian Kingston: That's correct, yes. Because of the federal mandate, the Quebec mandate and the B.C. mandate, the companies have no choice but to purchase credits. You can look up the amounts in the quarterly—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Okay.

Can you table that document?

[English]

Brian Kingston: Absolutely. I'd be happy to.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right. Thank you.

Is that your own document?

[English]

Brian Kingston: No, this is from the company. It's publicly available.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right.

They are Canadian companies, with the Canadian mandate.

Thank you—

[English]

Brian Kingston: No. This is Tesla's quarterly report.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right.

You've said Canadian companies have paid billions of dollars for credits because of the zero-emission vehicle mandate.

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes, that's correct.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right.

You will send us a document that substantiates what you have told us, namely, that Canadian companies actually paid billions of dollars because of Canada's zero-emission vehicle mandate. Is that correct?

[English]

Brian Kingston: I cannot show you the specific company-to-company contracts because those are commercially protected, but I can show you the amounts because those are publicly reported.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Very well.

I'd like you to send us a document that shows that Canadian companies paid billions of dollars. That's what we want to see.

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right.

You will table that.

[English]

Brian Kingston: I can give you the macro number. I'm not going to give you a specific amount that a company paid.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Okay.

I'd like to have the amounts pertaining to Canadian companies. It's easy to cite figures, but if you have them, we'd like to get them on paper.

[English]

Brian Kingston: Sure.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: What have you said about greenhouse gas emission reductions in transportation since 2011?

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes. Since 2011, and again, this is coming from Environment and Climate Change Canada, total emissions have come down for the passenger vehicle fleet by 49.8% and for light trucks by 30%.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: All right.

Are you referring to total emissions?

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes, that's correct.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Excuse me, but—

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes, and the target government—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: You can't say emissions for light vehicles in Canada have come down by 49% since 2011. That's impossible, Mr. Kingston, impossible.

Maybe you can say that light vehicles—

[English]

Brian Kingston: No, not for total transportation emissions. This is the efficiency of vehicles. The manufacturers are regulated to reduce the emissions.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: I'm talking about total emissions reduction and not about vehicle efficiency. What is the total emissions reduction?

The answer you just gave is simply not accurate.

[English]

Brian Kingston: Well, that depends. The population has been growing, so—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Kingston, I'll give you the figure. In Canada, emission reductions for light vehicles have been below 5% since 2011. That's what I'm referring to when I use the term "transportation".

Please be careful and don't try to take us for fools. We are environmental specialists, so please give us the true figures.

[English]

Brian Kingston: This is a report from Environment and Climate Change Canada—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: No. The reality is that greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector have barely gone down since 2011. That's a fact, regardless of whether vehicles are bigger or there are more SUVs.

[English]

Brian Kingston: When the population grows and people buy more vehicles, emissions will increase, naturally.

[Translation]

The Chair: The honourable member will come to order.

[English]

Wade Grant (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

It's hard for me to follow on the translation. If we could allow the—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: I apologize.

The Chair: Mr. Bonin, I'll ask you to demonstrate a bit more professionalism when you address witnesses, please.

Patrick Bonin: Understood.

What are you referring to, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: You told the witnesses not to take us for fools. I don't think that's appropriate and so I'm asking you to be a bit more professional when you ask questions.

Patrick Bonin: Very well.

The Chair: Additionally, please give the witness time to answer. You didn't do so on a few occasions.

Patrick Bonin: Yes.

The Chair: You asked him a question, and he responded, though it might not have been the answer you wanted to hear. You can't retroactively insinuate a different answer. That's not how it works. If you're unsatisfied with an answer, you can ask the question again, but you can't take it for granted that you can draw conclusions based on the answer you don't like.

You're putting words into the mouth of witnesses. You have the right to ask any question you wish and to ask the type of questions you like. However, I'm simply asking you to demonstrate a bit of professionalism with the witnesses, as a matter of courtesy.

• (1135)

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Chair, I'll let you pass judgment on the concept of professionalism and I'll let you do your work. However, please indulge me because it's important to get specific answers. I appreciate getting specific answers to my questions and most importantly, I want to get answers, and that's why I'm insisting on this issue, especially when we get poorly presented figures without any context.

The Chair: Mr. Bonin, please carry on with your work as you have been doing. I'm not asking you to make any changes. Just frame questions to witnesses in a professional manner. That's all.

You're free to debate this issue, but I wish to remind you that the witnesses are here to discuss a different subject.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Chair, I'm assuming you won't deduct these minutes from my speaking time.

The Chair: As I said, you did that several times, and that distorts the answers and sometimes even the questions. As the chair of the committee, I'll ask you to conduct yourself professionally. That's all. That will serve you well.

Witnesses are taking part in the meeting, but if you still want to debate this issue, we will give you examples to illustrate what I mean. That should be enough to satisfy you.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Chair, with all due respect, I think you are completely off topic.

The Chair: Look at how you're interacting with me.

Patrick Bonin: Yes, but you are talking about being professional.

The Chair: You're doing the same thing with the witness.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Chair, please let's get back to our witnesses.

You talk about professionalism, but you are passing judgment. If you don't want to start a discussion on what professionalism means to you, then we had better get back to our witnesses. I'll leave you to do your work. I don't think part of it consists in judging the quality of my work or whether I'm professional.

The Chair: Mr. Bonin, you are a member of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. We're all members of this committee.

Patrick Bonin: Yes.

The Chair: As the committee chair, I have to conduct proceedings in a professional manner. When a member does not conduct themselves professionally, I have to speak out against that.

If you don't agree, we can talk about this after the meeting. However, I'll tell you this: I have the last word, because I am the chair of this committee. If I see that you are not showing respect towards the witnesses, I will call you to order.

Would you like to continue with this discussion or would you like to focus on the questions you wish to ask the witnesses?

Patrick Bonin: I do want to put questions to the witnesses.

The Chair: You have exactly three minutes left. You have the floor.

Patrick Bonin: I think the committee is a sovereign body, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Patrick Bonin: I think we will discuss your role as chair.

I will continue from where I left off.

Mr. Kingston, you said that the lack of charging stations is a problem. From what I understand, more charging stations are needed. Is that right?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: That's correct, yes.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Kingston, but there's something called the zero-emission vehicle council that was launched by Transport Canada, and two of your members, General Motors and Stellantis, are on the council. I believe that two and a half years ago, there was an announcement about a high-power charging network known as Ionna, with the goal of having 30,000 charging stations by 2030.

How many charging stations have been installed in Canada so far?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: The CVMA is a member of the ZEV council, sitting as a co-chair of the charging group.

The objective that was set by government was 400,000 public chargers by 2035. There are 37,000 available today. Is that what you're referencing?

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: No, you didn't answer my question. You're part of the Ionna charging network because General Motors and Stellantis are your members. They committed to install 30,000 high-power chargers across North America by 2030.

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: Yes, right. You're talking about the Ionna charging network.

I don't have that number with me, but I can submit that to the committee.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: How many are there in Canada?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: At the time of the announcement, it was 30,000 in total for North America, and 10% of that was for Canada, but I can get you the breakdown of the current numbers.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: I'd like to know how many charging stations have been installed. You don't know. Are there any?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: I don't have the number with me today.

I'd have to ask the companies in that network for how much they've installed.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Can you send us those numbers in writing? I was told there are none. Is that possible?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: I can check.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Is that possible?

• (1140)

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: Is that possible? I don't know. I'd have to ask that company.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: You don't know. You're concerned about charging stations, and yet you don't know. Okay

You told us about greenhouse gas emissions reductions and you say that the current legislation is working. However, we've seen that in the United States, Mr. Trump wants to abolish emissions standards for light vehicles.

In your opinion, should we follow Mr. Trump and do what he is doing or should we maintain the most ambitious standards for light vehicles?

[*English*]

Brian Kingston: No, I don't believe that we should follow what the U.S. is doing with respect to the EPA.

Canada, in the past, has historically aligned by default its emission standards to the United States because of the integrated nature of the industry. However, when the federal government introduced the EVAS, they removed what was called incorporation by reference, which was automatic alignment. They removed that, anticipating that there could be a situation where you have diverging regulatory requirements.

The government has done that. Canada has the ability to establish its own GHG targets, and we've been making the case that we should use that lever to achieve the environmental objectives of the government.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kingston.

Mrs. Anstey, the floor is yours for five minutes.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

There are a couple of reports that have been produced, Mr. Reuss and Mr. Bernard, and I'm wondering if you will be able to table them for the benefit of the committee. I've read through them and I think they would be beneficial.

Mr. Kingston, I want to start with you.

The Liberal government paused the 2026 EV mandate citing market challenges and industry pressures. What does that pause say about the overall feasibility of the government's approach, in your opinion?

Brian Kingston: I think the pause is a recognition that this regulation isn't working and the targets are unfeasible.

We were on track for 9.7% sales for this year and getting to that 2026 target would require a 200-plus per cent increase in sales. I think the government recognized that the regulation is not working.

Carol Anstey: We've often heard a reference to Norway when they're talking about adoption. I want to give you an opportunity to talk about why that's a little bit of an outlier.

Brian Kingston: It's a total outlier and I don't think it's a fair comparison.

The majority of the population in Norway lives in one urban area, in Oslo, so the driving distances are nowhere close to what you would see here in Canada.

We have 1.1 million kilometres of public two-lane road in this country. Twenty per cent of the population lives in rural communities and significant northern communities where driving distances are large and communities depend on diesel-powered electricity. The Norway comparison really doesn't pan out here at all.

On top of that, Norway has used significant revenues from its oil and gas industry to put in place subsidies at a scale that we would never do in Canada to incentivize the purchase of EVs, so I think the Norway example is not fair.

Carol Anstey: What's happening in other major auto-producing regions, like the U.K., Germany and other parts of the EU?

Brian Kingston: Virtually every jurisdiction that has put in place an EV mandate has had to back off it, recognizing it's not working. California adjusts their targets so often it's almost laughable now. It's well over 10 times where they've put in place targets; the targets are missed and then they adjust. The U.K. has backed off their target and Europe is now backing off some of their targets because they've realized that these policies don't work.

Carol Anstey: Thank you.

When I have brought up the lack of feasibility in rural and remote areas, I've often heard that there's misinformation and that we have to bust the myths. I want to give you an opportunity to expand on this. Is it that rural residents are misinformed, or is it that this disproportionately impacts them in a negative way?

Brian Kingston: It disproportionately impacts them in a negative way. That's what Environment Canada has said. The issue is this: When a consumer buys a vehicle, they buy it for all of the needs they will have. While it's true that, if you look at average driving distances of Canadians, maybe it is only 40 or 50 kilometres a day, but if, twice a year, they drive 1,200 kilometres, which is very normal for a lot of Canadian families, they're going to want a vehicle that can meet all of those needs. That's the challenge we have.

Early adopters have bought their EVs. You saw a lot of that in urban areas, particularly in more wealthy neighbourhoods, where people were buying an EV as a second or third vehicle. We have

satisfied that part of that market. We're now moving into mass-market adoption—a household with two kids, an absolute maximum budget of \$40,000 and they have family all over the province. Trying to convince that person to buy an EV with 450 kilometres of range is a very tough sell at this point.

We'll get there. The technology will get better, but it's a tough sell. If government mandates it, you're going to have push-back, which we do not want to have happen for this technology.

• (1145)

Carol Anstey: Thank you.

Also, to meet the 2030 target, EV sales would need to grow by 45% every year. Do you see any evidence that such a growth rate is achievable?

Brian Kingston: It's not possible. The only way it could be achieved would be with massive government purchase subsidies, but the cost would be quite significant to the fiscal.

Carol Anstey: An analysis published in the Canadian Journal of Economics suggested that EV mandates outpace cost parity and consumer demand, and that Canada could potentially face a collapse of its auto manufacturing sector—the loss of more than 100,000 jobs. How concerned should Canadians be about that risk?

Brian Kingston: They should be hugely concerned. This industry is critically important to the Canadian economy.

The only study that was done—and it was done in the Canadian Journal of Economics, which is a peer-reviewed analysis—showed that the EV mandate would “effectively destroy”—that's the terminology—the Canadian auto industry. At a time when we're under massive pressure from U.S. tariffs, this is the last thing the sector needs.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Grant, the floor is yours for five minutes.

Wade Grant: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses.

It's good to see you again, Mr. Kingston. I'll start with you.

In your opening comments you talked about...you never supported the electric vehicle availability standard. Could you expand on how you would propose Canadian automakers compete in the evolving auto sector in this country?

Brian Kingston: First, I'd say that the federal government worked very closely with the sector to help the sector transition to electrification. We went through the biggest reinvestment in history in this industry—\$46 billion in new investment between 2020 and now, including major investments into battery production, as well as critical minerals mining and converting facilities to electrification.

The challenge that we face is that EV demand did not keep up with the initial, very optimistic forecast that we all had around the pace of uptake. There has been a lot of success, but we have to adjust to the market, and the market is saying, right now, that Canadians don't want EVs at the rate that government has dictated.

Wade Grant: Can you explain how we, as a government, can ensure a coordinated approach to EV adoption that would work across the auto sector?

Brian Kingston: First and foremost, I would love to see one regulation. I know we talk a lot, particularly in light of the economic challenges we're facing, about building a stronger Canada and getting rid of interprovincial trade barriers. It would be extremely helpful to the auto industry if automakers weren't having to comply with, right now, four regulations: a Quebec EV mandate, a B.C. EV mandate, a federal EV mandate and GHG emissions standards.

The best thing that could be done is if everyone were to agree on one single regulatory tool, ideally the technology-agnostic GHG regulations. That would strengthen the sector and help government meet its own environmental targets.

Wade Grant: I'll go to you, Mr. Reuss, on the dealership side, and ask you the same question. How, as a government, can we ensure a coordinated approach to EV adoption in this country?

Tim Reuss: It would definitely help to have a technology agnostic approach to things. Again, not every single case or every community will be able to operate with an electric vehicle. However, a plug-in hybrid solution, or other solutions that manufacturers haven't even thought of, such as hydrogen fuel cells, might all be part of the solution going forward. The EV mandate unfortunately mandates just one technology. If we had one ask, it would be to have it as technology agnostic as possible.

I'm going to use one example that you might be surprised about. A lot of times proponents of the mandate tell us that's what they had to do with seat belts in order to get seat belts. Well, you didn't mandate seat belts; you mandated that people need to be sustained or maintained in their positions in a vehicle, in case of an accident, to protect them. However, you didn't mandate that it had to be made of polymer with a certain latch, initially.

Then industry started innovating from that. You have pretensioners on seat belts and things of that nature. By the way, you didn't prescribe something that might shrink 40% if it's winter, and then if I ate too much, maybe the seat belt would no longer fit and I couldn't drive home after an extensive dinner. This is what we talk about. Technology agnostic would be probably the most important thing on this.

Wade Grant: Thanks.

Mr. Reuss, this year the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association called on Canada to adopt European, Korean and Japanese auto

safety standards to help dealers ensure that Canadians have access to a wide array of affordable vehicles.

Could you tell us how allowing imports from these markets will help provide Canadians with more choices in the long term in the EV market?

• (1150)

Tim Reuss: There are certain vehicles currently available in those markets—and again, we're only talking about those three jurisdictions, Europe, Japan and South Korea—with which Canada has free trade agreements currently in place. The Canadian companies would like to bring these vehicles into Canada. Dealers would love to sell them, and Canadian consumers would love to buy them. However, these are vehicles that the Americans don't want.

Currently, our emissions and safety standards are solely aligned with the U.S. We're not saying we should move away from that. We should open ourselves additionally to accept, within a certain range, vehicles from those three jurisdictions. If a vehicle is deemed safe enough environmentally, that's fine, but if it can be driven on a German autobahn at 200 kilometres an hour, it should be safe enough for Canadian roads.

Wade Grant: I think I have a couple of seconds left.

Very quickly, Mr. Kingston, what does the CVMA see as an appropriate type of infrastructure needed to support the EV transition?

Brian Kingston: I would point back to the NRCan assessment. For public infrastructure, 400,000 public charging ports would be needed by 2035. In addition, 11 million home chargers would be needed. That's the big challenge with 30% of Canadians living in multi-unit residential homes. Trying to give those people a home charger is very challenging, but that's what we have to focus on, because the benefits of an EV are really when you can charge it at home overnight.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kingston.

Thank you, Mr. Grant.

[Translation]

Mr. Bonin, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Bernard, earlier, you spoke about the percentage sales of electric vehicles. Electric vehicle sales have declined in 2025. Do you think this decline is attributable to the fact that the government removed the incentives offered for the purchase of electric vehicles, among other factors?

The government did say it would restore the incentives, but it has not done so. No doubt some people are waiting for incentives to come back. Do you think this has had an impact on electric vehicle sales?

Charles Bernard: It's clear that uncertainty has played a role in consumers' decisions. The figures I cited show a gap between the months leading to the end of 2024 when people thought the incentives were going to be removed.

There is no doubt that incentives play a role when it comes to demand that is not connected to the electric vehicle availability standard.

Does the uncertainty around incentives slow down demand for electric vehicles? I think that's a valid argument. The other argument is that even with incentives and very high sales volume—Quebec is a good example—we're still very far from the targets.

Quebec's target is very high and the target in Canada—

Patrick Bonin: I'm sorry, but I'll stop you there.

You've said that we're still a long way from hitting targets. Earlier, you spoke about a 20% target for 2026. What proportion of new vehicles sold in Quebec last year was electric?

Charles Bernard: The figure stood at 40% by the end of 2024 and 32% before that. However, during the two quarters I spoke about, which were linked to the expected phase-out of incentives, the figures stood at 23% and 26.2%.

Patrick Bonin: What was the percentage for the whole of last year?

Charles Bernard: Last year, it was 21%.

Patrick Bonin: I don't get it. The target for 2026 is 20%, isn't it?

Charles Bernard: Yes, that's right.

Patrick Bonin: You said that last year, sales in Quebec—

Charles Bernard: That's the federal target, Mr. Bonin.

Patrick Bonin: I know, but I'm actually talking about the federal target.

You've said the target is unachievable, that it's unrealistic and that we are not on track to reach it.

You've said that last year, over 20% of new vehicles sold in Quebec were electric.

Charles Bernard: Yes.

Patrick Bonin: I don't understand why you're saying the target is unachievable, that we're not on track and that it's not working, and yet, Quebec hit that target last year.

Charles Bernard: You're talking about one province. I would agree that Quebec had reached the target, but—

Patrick Bonin: Yes.

Charles Bernard: —it's important to point out that when manufacturers look at their results at the end of the year, they're not looking at the results for Quebec. Manufacturers in Quebec faced similar pressure because the provincial target was 32%.

I would say yes, if we isolate Quebec—

Patrick Bonin: I understand, but we're also talking about targets. There is some flexibility with targets, isn't there?

Charles Bernard: Yes.

Patrick Bonin: There's the possibility of purchasing credits—

Charles Bernard: Yes.

Patrick Bonin: —and investing money in chargers.

Vehicles sold in previous years can still be used during the reference year, correct?

Charles Bernard: Yes.

Patrick Bonin: Okay.

The Chair: Please give a brief answer.

Charles Bernard: Studies also show that this calculation of credits would not have allowed us to meet federal targets and that there was a risk Canada's inventory would have a shortfall of 400,000 vehicles. I'm talking about Canada, not Quebec. I don't know if that would have been the case in Joliette or Rimouski. However, that has an impact in Canada, namely, 400,000 fewer units, and this has an impact on prices and consumer choice.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bernard.

I would just like to inform witnesses that you can contact the committee in writing. If you don't have enough time to complete your answers or if you wish to expand on them, you may provide additional information to the clerk in writing. Any additions are always welcome.

[English]

Mr. Leslie, the floor is yours for five minutes.

• (1155)

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To build on that, Mr. Gessaroli in particular, given some of the data you outlined on the unfair distribution of low-income and rural people, could you submit all of that data? I think it's a continuation of policies that, unfortunately, are making it harder to live in this country.

I'd like to turn to Mr. Reuss.

Car dealers have been sounding the alarm, as you mentioned, for quite a while regarding the unworkability of this EV mandate. You've been ignored for a long time. Now we're at point where nobody really knows what's going to happen.

From your vantage point, could you describe the level of frustration that exists amongst dealer owners?

Tim Reuss: I would characterize it as a deep concern because they've already made the investments. Over \$3.4 billion have been spent by all of our members. Now they're not selling the units as much as they thought and as much as the manufacturers thought. There is a deep concern when they see that. Mix that in with the concerns that we currently have overall as an industry and as dealers with the trade environment and you can imagine what our members are going through.

Our members are made up of small, medium and large companies that might have only 40 employees in their location. They don't know whether they're going to be able to exist or not if certain vehicles are cut off because of Trump's tariffs. They're not able to sell EVs at the rates that they had.

The investment they've made is sunk money. That's already done. This is in charging infrastructure, in training and special lifts for the vehicles. By the way, you need a forklift in every single dealership to be able to take out a battery in case you need to take it out. It's things of that nature that are probably not considered.

Our members are the first ones who have the pulse of what's going on in the market because they have the vehicles. If they're not able to sell them, they let us know fairly quickly why that is and what the customers are telling them.

Is there interest in EVs? Yes, absolutely. Will EVs be part of the solution? Absolutely they will be a growing part of the solution. It's just not at the pace that is currently outlined in the standards.

Branden Leslie: I'll turn to Mr. Bernard to comment from an economic standpoint and to continue on with what you were just saying.

Do you believe that the EV mandate regulations are the most effective way to convince people that they should buy an EV?

Charles Bernard: The answer is no to that. I don't believe it's a tool made to convince people to buy EVs. It's a supply-side program and tool. We can have a good discussion on how it served its purposes, for example, for our dealers who have invested over \$3 billion in infrastructure, but it's a supply-side tool. Now the issue is on the demand side.

No, it's not a great tool to convince. I'd say quite the opposite. I think it's a tool for the supply side with a lot of wishful thinking on the demand side.

Branden Leslie: We keep hearing this idea that somehow this is going to increase choice. Continuing on that, in your view what policies would actually expand choice for consumers?

Charles Bernard: I'll go first and then I'll let Tim talk.

It's not a policy that's going to increase choice. It's going to limit it quite extensively.

Tim Reuss: By having technology neutral regulation, you're going to see more choice because you're going to have companies compete for that business, innovating in that space more than they are today where everybody's focused on one portion of it only.

Imagine how far hybrids have come in the last couple of years to the plug-ins now available, but unfortunately not yet at the range that is foreseen of a minimum of 80 kilometres for plug-ins in the current regulations. Those things will happen. Once you have technology-agnostic regulation and you just mandate an outcome, you're going to have more competition and therefore more choice.

Branden Leslie: Thank you for your very common-sense recommendations off the bat in your opening remarks of how to try to fix this problem.

Mr. Kingston, I'd like to move to you.

On that back and forth we had previously, you stated that Canadian auto manufacturers have committed over \$1 billion toward credits required for the 20% target. To the best of your knowledge, have Canadian companies actually bought credits from American automakers such as Tesla—not just committed, but bought credits with real money?

• (1200)

Brian Kingston: Yes, my understanding is that they have.

Branden Leslie: How much, could you say again?

Brian Kingston: It's over \$1 billion, and if you look at the deficit in sales now to 2030, it would cost at least \$3 billion to comply with this regulation.

Branden Leslie: It looks to me, based on the numbers you mentioned, that Tesla has received about \$800 million, which likely has to be from Canada.

With that, Mr. Chair, I would like to move a motion that I hope will get to the bottom of this for my Bloc colleague and all of the folks around this table as to the question of whether or not money from Canadian automakers has been sent to Tesla. I move:

That the Committee request Tesla, Inc. or any of its relevant subsidiaries operating in Canada ("Tesla") to produce the following information as it relates to the Government of Canada's Electric Vehicle Availability Standard: (a) How many compliance credits has Tesla: (i) already sold as of October 31, 2025, or (ii) committed to sell, to any corporation in Canada (or respective related corporate entity); and, (b) the associated total revenue in Canadian (\$) dollar equivalent for each above category, namely already received by Tesla and committed to receive; and, that this information be provided to the committee no later than 4:00 pm EST on Wednesday, December 10, 2025.

I recognize that Mr. Kingston is unable to provide the number for the outflow of Canadian cash due to the commercial sensitivities of this credit market. Recognizing that Tesla is the only or sole manufacturer that would have such an excess that it would be the seller in this carbon market, I think it's reasonable for us to be definitive as to whether or not hundreds of millions of dollars have actually flowed out of this country. I think it's fair to say that it's one thing if a dollar value of \$1 billion or more has been committed versus doing so at a time when we've had such a liquidity crisis for our automakers in this country and such a challenging international trade environment with the United States. I'm not sure whether or not Tesla will be transparent. Obviously, their financial disclosures already have the bulk number, so I hope they might be willing to try to play ball.

To my colleague Mr. Bonin, Tesla is the one that would hold this information, so I hope I could get the support to find out, not who is telling the truth here necessarily, but whether or not there has actually been an outflow.

I hope I can get support from all my colleagues to make this request of Tesla to find out if Canadian companies, at a time when they need capital, have been forced due to this scheme to purchase compliance credits from an American auto manufacturer, most likely Tesla, based on the financial disclosures.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Leslie.

Before I go to Mr. St-Pierre, I'd like to ask members if they want to release the witnesses, so that we can look at this proposed motion.

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): I have a point of order on that.

I respect the member's motion and would love to debate it. I was going to ask if we could continue with the questioning. I have about five minutes of questions, and my colleague has about two and a half minutes.

I would propose that we continue with the questioning and then proceed to your motion if everybody would agree to that.

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent for that? I need unanimous consent to go with that.

Branden Leslie: I'm curious. Maybe we could do a quick straw poll.

Is there a willingness to ask this? I think it's just open information. I look to my colleague from the Bloc and my Liberal colleagues if there is an interest in quickly passing this motion so we could get back to the witnesses. All it is is a request by the environment committee to Tesla and any affiliates to provide the information I outlined in this motion, which would provide clarity for all Canadians, and certainly for this committee after such a back and forth that we had between one of my colleagues and one of the witnesses regarding this specific information.

There is simply one company that has this information. If we ask, we might just find out the answer and I think we could put the issue to bed once and for all.

I'd propose we quickly go to a vote, pass the motion and move on.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. St-Pierre, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

Eric St-Pierre: I would ask that we give seven minutes, release the witnesses and thank them for their time, and then have an hour of committee business to discuss the motion. We would need a few minutes to read the motion.

I think it's a reasonable request to ask for seven minutes of additional time with the witnesses.

Branden Leslie: I'd like to move forward with this motion.

The Chair: I think it would be appropriate—

Branden Leslie: I'm sorry for interrupting, Mr. Chair. I believe we circulated the motion. If we could have it circulated now, your office—

The Chair: We have the motion only in English, so we'd need to suspend in order for the clerk to translate it into French so that Monsieur Bonin can have a copy.

Mr. St-Pierre.

• (1205)

Eric St-Pierre: Can I request a printed copy of the motion in both languages?

Thank you.

The Chair: Yes, that's what we're working on.

We are suspended.

• (1205)

(Pause)

• (1215)

• (1220)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

The clerk advises me that he is having a technical difficulty with the printer. Unfortunately, if you really need that paper copy, we'll need to suspend for him to go and get it.

Branden Leslie: Mr. Chair, while we wait, is it possible to finish the remaining half of a round that Mr. St-Pierre requested? I believe my Bloc colleague would have a portion of that. If we don't suspend, at that point, we could go straight to the debate on the motion I moved without any break.

My fear is that we would automatically break for the second hour, but I would very much like us to agree as a committee to continue the debate on the Tesla request motion immediately following the dismissal of the witnesses, once we have completed the two partial rounds remaining.

Is that something we could all agree on?

Eric St-Pierre: That's exactly what I proposed earlier, so I'm glad to see you're having a come to Jesus moment. I'm happy to go with that in good faith. Thank you.

The Chair: We are resuming debate.

Mr. Leslie, you have the floor for a couple of seconds.

• (1225)

Branden Leslie: Thank you all for being here and providing a common-sense perspective on this important issue for Canadians.

The Chair: You have a couple more, but I'll accept what you decide to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. St-Pierre, you have the floor for five minutes.

[*English*]

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Reuss, when you talk about choice, it's interesting. Seat belts were referred to earlier. It's interesting because automakers actually initially resisted the use of seat belts, also arguing for choice. I find that interesting when we make a reference to seat belts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard, among your members, electric vehicle sales in Ford and GM dealerships in Saint-Hyacinthe, a beautiful community in Quebec, have to date accounted for between 34% and 40% of total sales, even though there are no federal rebates.

What are your thoughts on the possible repeal of this regulation?

Charles Bernard: Thank you.

That's a good question. I'll respond with two points.

First, the figures are very encouraging, and this shows that indeed, more and more consumers and dealerships want to be present on the market. These numbers have gone up because of the announcement that rebates would be phased out. We can see that the numbers were much lower at the beginning of 2025.

This week, we carried out a survey involving 600 dealership members. Of the 250 respondents from Quebec, 74% were in favour of the removal of the electric vehicle sales mandate. Additionally, 68% of the respondents had experienced a strong or very strong decline in demand for these vehicles.

Does this mean that they are withdrawing from the market? Not at all. In fact, it's quite the opposite, and this is noteworthy. I think it ties in somewhat with what I said during my very interesting discussion with Mr. Bonin. Figures showing a positive trend don't necessarily mean that the people selling these vehicles think the policy is effective.

Eric St-Pierre: Thank you very much, Mr. Bernard.

[*English*]

Mr. Gessaroli, in the past you've said that Canada should do the following:

Get rid of the government heavy hand of overtaxing and enforcing inefficient and ineffective regulations. Get rid of all of that. Encourage competition in the marketplace. And over time, we'd find Canadians can be quite innovative and

quite competitive in our own right. And we can hold our own. We can be better off.

Do you think we should be encouraging competition in the marketplace?

Jerome Gessaroli: Yes, I do believe we should encourage competition in the marketplace.

Eric St-Pierre: How do you feel about the tariffs currently on Chinese EVs?

Jerome Gessaroli: The tariffs on the Chinese EVs are due to some very important strategic geopolitical factors. Security, in some ways, always trumps economics. A fulsome debate should be made as to how to best handle that.

Eric St-Pierre: Should we have Chinese EVs in the marketplace?

Jerome Gessaroli: At this point, I'm not really prepared to answer that categorically either way.

As a basic concept, yes, competition is very good, but competition for the sake of competition, if it interferes with the security interests of the country.... That should be taking priority.

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Kingston, we've talked about choice. Should we have some more choice? What's your perspective on allowing Chinese EV choice into the market?

Brian Kingston: It's a definitive no for three reasons.

One, we took this policy stance because we had to align with the Americans. The Americans put a tariff on Chinese EVs. We are in very sensitive conversations with the Americans around renewing our trade agreement. If we take a different stance with respect to China, our North American trade agreement is at risk, which is a much bigger threat to the Canadian economy.

Two, it's not a fair fight. The Chinese centrally controlled government has put \$230 billion U.S. in direct subsidies. They follow a model of scale, dump and destroy. They scale domestic capacity, dump excess capacity around the world and destroy industries in other countries. They've done it with solar panels; they've done it with steel and they're trying to do it with cars.

Last, the federal government has banned TikTok, citing security concerns. In what world would we allow people to drive around in vehicles with cameras and sensors that could be controlled from Beijing when you won't allow people to use a social media platform?

• (1230)

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Kingston, CVMA has about three members, GM, Ford and Stellantis, which was formerly Chrysler. Back in 2009, the U.S., Ontario and Canadian governments, under the Harper government contributed over \$13 billion to bail out the two automakers.

I'll be very quick. Are we to understand that this was sort of market involvement, and is this something that we should pay back? Should the sector pay back those loans?

The Chair: Give a very short answer.

Brian Kingston: The companies did pay back those loans, and we're now succeeding as a result of Canada supporting the industry during a difficult time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kingston.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. St-Pierre.

Mr. Bonin, you have the floor for two and a half minutes. We had a bit of a delay, so I'll give you more time to continue with your questions.

Patrick Bonin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Kingston, in your opinion, would the removal of the electric vehicle standard compromise the achievement of Canada's greenhouse gas reduction targets?

[English]

Brian Kingston: No, we have existing regulations.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: No? Okay.

In his latest report, the Parliamentary Budget Officer stated that suspending the standard for 2026 alone sets Canada back, and that the gap between where Canada is headed and the target is even greater because of the suspension of the standard for 2026. What are your thoughts on that?

Do you agree with what he said?

[English]

Brian Kingston: Yes, I did think it was incorrect because it was clear that we're not going to hit any of the targets in these EV mandates. The regulation itself is not having an effect if companies can't achieve it, if the demand isn't there.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: You are saying that what the Parliamentary Budget Officer is saying is wrong. When he says that Canada is falling behind the target by suspending the standard for 2026, you are saying that he is wrong. Is that correct?

[English]

Brian Kingston: I'm saying that the report was incorrect in some of its assumptions, and we had issues with the—

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Okay. That's interesting. Can you send us something in writing with more details to explain why the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report is incorrect?

I'll now turn to Mr. Bernard.

Mr. Bernard, I'd like to have a further discussion about vehicle prices. Some of the people who have appeared before this committee have said that the zero-emission standard served to ensure there are more vehicles and that it helped lower the cost of vehicles, and we've seen that. I've seen figures that show that prices of new vehicles went up by 43% between 2019 and 2025. The increase occurred before the zero-emission standard came in.

However, you have told us that the zero-emission standard would not result in more cost-effective and cheaper vehicles in Canada. Is that correct?

Charles Bernard: Yes, I would say so.

Most studies have shown that because of the constraints you mentioned earlier, which are difficult to navigate, the standard will make many companies restrict the total number of vehicles they ship to Canada, be they electric or non-electric. By restricting the supply of vehicles, regardless of the technology chosen, fewer offers in a market where there is constant demand will cause prices to rise. Furthermore, it is clear—

Patrick Bonin: I'm going to stop you there to clarify something.

My understanding is the opposite of what you're saying. There is a wider selection of electric vehicles when companies are forced to have more electric vehicles. We've seen that in Europe.

Why do you say that there would be fewer options? From what we've heard and observed, the opposite is true. European markets that have implemented this mandate have a greater variety of vehicles, with more compact and affordable models.

However, you're saying that if there was zero-emission standard legislation, there would be fewer options.

Charles Bernard: Generally, Canadian consumers are not looking for the smaller vehicles you mentioned.

If companies have to ship fewer vehicles to hit targets, they will not send vehicles that appeal to a small niche in downtown Montreal or Toronto. They will send vehicles with strong sales potential. If they sell vehicles that perform strongly in the market and generate high sales volumes, they achieve economies of scale. That's smart from an economic standpoint and smart from a pricing standpoint.

Reducing inventory means what's sent to Canada will generally align with demand across Canada, and not just in Quebec. People want bigger vehicles that have more emissions; they want pickup trucks or heavier vehicles.

The Chair: Thank you for that answer, Mr. Bernard.

Thank you, Mr. Bonin.

• (1235)

[*English*]

I would like to thank the witnesses for their testimony today.

The witnesses are now excused.

We are suspended.

• (1235)

(Pause)

• (1240)

The Chair: Mr. Leslie, the floor is yours.

Branden Leslie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all of our support staff who worked diligently to resolve an IT issue. I believe we should now all have a copy in both French and English, circulated digitally and physically, of the motion I read into the record toward the end of my questioning of Brian Kingston from the manufacturers' association. It was specifically regarding questions from, I think, many around this table—and rumours, we'll call them, that are unverified—in terms of whether or not Canadian auto manufacturers have sent cold, hard cash to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars to American automakers, most likely based on the criteria of producing a high enough volume of electric vehicles to create the credits under the credit exchange system.

We had a bit of an exchange between my Bloc colleague, one of the witnesses, and you, Mr. Chair, regarding that particular question. Given the difficulties and, I think, a lack of transparency, frankly, that certainly will exist in this credit scheme that has been developed as an attempt at flexibility of an electric vehicle mandate, the commercial sensitivities as to the costing of these specific credits on an individual basis is the reason for...the commercial sensitivities and the inability for any of the manufacturers to specifically disclose.

Hence, in the motion I tried to be broad enough to further differentiate what we know Tesla's compliance credits revenues have been in two of the quarters from this year, recognizing that they are certainly not all from the Californian portion of the North American credit markets. Certainly, Canada has contributed, as evidenced by the representative who came here from the manufacturers, so we know that they have been bought. Given the limitations of those contracts, I think it's reasonable to ask the only party we know has the information and has the ability to share it with us.

In that vein, that is why my motion today is to request that Tesla tell us how many compliance credits Tesla has already sold as of the end of October of this year and has committed to sell, as well as the overall total Canadian dollar equivalents for each of those categories. This is to know with some finitude whether or not, at a time of a liquidity crisis for Canadian auto manufacturers and a jobs crisis for so many people, particularly in southwestern Ontario....

The challenges facing this sector are immense. We have government trying to take action, but they apparently have policies in place that are at odds and are causing so much confusion. They've potentially driven hundreds of millions of dollars of much-needed cash from these companies to an American auto manufacturer, particularly Tesla.

In an effort at transparency, I think it's very reasonable for the environment committee to make this request to Tesla. There's no guarantee that they would share this information with us, but I hope I can have unanimous support from all our colleagues to provide clarity to Canadians on what the outcomes of this policy and the confusion sown from the pause have been and whether or not the manufacturing industry is out potentially hundreds of millions of dollars. It will hopefully help lead to future policy decisions on whether or not we should completely eliminate the EV mandate to stop the bleed, or whether or not the companies have been honest in the amount of money they have already sent to the American auto manufacturers and/or committed.

With that, I hope we can get to a relatively quick vote with support from all my colleagues, I hope, in an effort to have transparency for Canadians.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I will give the floor to Mr. St-Pierre in a moment.

[*Translation*]

We have to table all motions in both official languages for the benefit of Mr. Bonin. You also have the option of getting a hard copy. This will ensure the proceedings move on without additional delay. Thank you.

Mr. St-Pierre, you have the floor.

• (1245)

Eric St-Pierre: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank you for the French version.

[*English*]

It was an observation I made as well. I appreciate that there's a bilingual version for my colleague and me.

I appreciate this motion. I think it's quite reasonable. I wasn't sure if you were going to seek Elon Musk as a witness, but I see that's not in the motion.

I don't have much else to comment on. I do appreciate this version.

I think it's a reasonable request. Thank you for raising it.

The Chair: Is there any further debate?

[*Translation*]

You have the floor, Mr. Bonin.

Patrick Bonin: Thank you for the French version.

I do appreciate that your goal is to find out how many credits were sold in Canada.

The motion asks: “How many compliance credits has Tesla... committed to sell, to any corporation in Canada”. I think that means the credits sold in Canada. I don’t know if you can appreciate the subtle nuance. If a corporation in Canada is buying credits from the United States, then that’s not the kind of information we want to obtain. That’s why I’m asking whether we can specify that.

We can move an amendment that says: “How many compliance credits has Tesla...already sold as of October 31, 2025, in Canada?”

The Chair: Mr. Leslie, would you like to address that comment or would you like the member to move an amendment?

[*English*]

Branden Leslie: Maybe I can address this before moving an amendment.

In the motion, in the first part, I believe that’s already covered under (ii), “committed to sell, to any corporation in Canada”. To me, the motion is explicit. If they are selling to a U.S.-based auto manufacturer due to a lack of compliance with the Californian mandate they have in place.... I agree we don’t necessarily need that information. I think it’s just Canada, but that’s why, to me, the specific language of “to any corporation in Canada” should cover that off.

I don’t think there’s a need for an amendment.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: I’m not sure.

I don’t want us to get mixed figures that include numbers for the United States and then we won’t be able to determine the impact of the zero-emission legislation in Canada. I do understand that you’re not interested in numbers concerning the purchase of emissions credits in the United States by Canadian corporations. You want to know how many credits Tesla has sold to Canadian businesses due to the zero-emission legislation in Canada.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Leslie.

Branden Leslie: Yes, I would be open to a friendly amendment. I could suggest one that somebody else could move that, in the middle of the second line of the first point where it says, “How many compliance credits has Tesla (a) already sold as of October 31, 2025, to Canadian companies” or “Canadian corporations”. Would that offer the clarity you’re looking for?

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Yes. You alluded to the English version and I’m trying to compare the English version with the French version.

The Chair: Would you like the clerk to translate the text? That might be easier.

Patrick Bonin: Point (a) of the English version and the French version are not consistent. There are two (b)s in English and only one in French. That’s why I’m a bit confused.

The Chair: I understand your confusion. Before we go any further, I’ll ask the clerk to take a look and correct that point and then we’ll talk about it.

[*English*]

Mr. Clerk, you have an (a), a (b) and a (b) in English, and then you have an (a) and a (b). You have two (b)s and only one (b) in the French. Can you please modify the text?

Do you see it?

• (1250)

The Clerk of the Committee (Leif-Erik Aune): I see the translation issue.

The Chair: We’ll have the clerk explain it to him so this way he’ll be more reassured.

The Clerk: [*Inaudible—Editor*] “has Tesla (a) already sold as of”.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Bonin, you have the floor.

Patrick Bonin: I’d like to clarify one issue. I want to make sure we don’t mix up Canada and the United States under the same point. That’s my thinking.

I can’t help but think that we should also have information on sales of compliance credits for all Canadian automakers. Since we’re already asking Tesla, it might be helpful to ask other automakers to provide this information as well.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Leslie.

Branden Leslie: I wish our witnesses were still here, because they would have a better sense from the manufacturing perspective.

I’m not opposed to that. My understanding is that the answer from everybody but Tesla was that they don’t sell any, because they don’t produce a high enough threshold of EVs to enter the creation of a credit market. If they do, they’re just holding on to them, because they don’t have a high enough volume. Hence, Tesla makes up 99% plus of all of the credits that are available for sale in this North American credit market.

I’m not opposed to it, but I think that’s ultimately what’s going to come back from the other companies: “We don’t sell any. We haven’t sold any yet, at least.”

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: That’s an excellent point, my friend, but I think we can ask for information on sales and credits, for example.

For instance, I’d like to know whether Kia had 20% in electric vehicle sales and if it has already obtained these credits. I understand you’re presuming that they won’t sell credits. I don’t know that. I guess it’s possible, but I’d like to know how many credits they have in relation to the 20% targets. I’m interested in the total number of credits accumulated to date. I do understand your point, but I think we can ask them what they have in terms of credits and sales. It may well be that they don’t sell any.

[*English*]

Branden Leslie: I'm not opposed to adding a very simple point prior to "That this information be provided", which is that the other major auto manufacturers—GM, Stellantis, Ford and Honda—provide the same information, or something along those lines. I'm not opposed to that request going out to them.

I'm also curious about the answer. Based on what my understanding is, I think that they're just not in the market, but I see no issue in asking all of the companies.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: You'll soon receive the electronic version of the two paragraphs that have been amended to include the word "Canadian".

Is that right, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk of the Committee (Leif-Erik Aune): Yes.

The Chair: Great.

We'll start with that and then if we have a positive outcome, we will see whether other changes are necessary.

You'll receive copies in both official languages to make things easier.

Would you like the clerk to read out the text with the amendments to the wording, or would you like to wait until you receive the document and read it?

• (1255)

Patrick Bonin: I'm okay with it being read out loud.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, can you read out both parts of the proposed amendment in English and French?

The Clerk: Following discussion among members, on behalf of Mr. Bonin, the proposed amendment is to add the words "to Canadian corporations" after the words "as of October 31, 2025".

I wish to remind members that you will receive a copy of the amended text shortly.

The Chair: That's great.

You continued with the discussion, which has not yet been included.

We will therefore proceed with the first subamendment proposed and we will see if other amendments will be proposed.

Have you received the documents?

Mr. St-Pierre, I'm sorry you won't get a hard copy, but you'll have the gist of the content.

Eric St-Pierre: I'll do my best.

The Chair: I see that members have received the documents.

I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome the honourable Bill Blair, who has joined us.

Mr. Bonin, can you confirm that the wording in English and French is consistent?

Patrick Bonin: Yes, Mr. Chair.

In the interest of continuous improvement, is it possible to have the same format in both languages? For example, in point (a) of the English version, points (i) and (ii) are in the same sentence, but this is different in French. That's for purposes of comparison; otherwise, it looks consistent at first glance.

The Chair: Would you like to have the changes made immediately or just in the Minutes of Proceedings?

The clerk has assured me that the Minutes of Proceedings will reflect this change. My understanding is that you are satisfied with the wording and only the formatting needs to be adjusted. The words "to Canadian corporations" will be included.

Do we have further comments about this amendment?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: We'll now turn back to the main motion.

Mr. Bonin, would you like to propose other amendments?

Patrick Bonin: I think my colleague seems amenable to including sales and credits for other auto manufacturers in Canada in the motion.

The Chair: Is it a matter of including this wording?

Patrick Bonin: It's a matter of asking all automakers to provide information on sales and credits.

• (1300)

The Chair: Can you tell the clerk exactly where this wording will go so we get a better idea?

I think Ms. Anstey has already drafted the text in English. We'll start with that and then translate it into French.

[*English*]

Ms. Anstey is going to read it out.

Carol Anstey: The following would be added: "(c) that the other major auto manufacturers in Canada, namely Ford, Toyota, Honda, General Motors, and Stellantis be also called to provide the same information."

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Are Kia and Hyundai on your list?

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Bonin is asking if Kia is included.

Carol Anstey: Those are the major Canadian manufacturers. That's what's listed.

Patrick Bonin: They are under the mandate as well.

Carol Anstey: We can add Kia, no problem.

Patrick Bonin: Why don't we just ask for all manufacturers that are falling under this?

[*Translation*]

Here I am speaking in English. My apologies.

[English]

Branden Leslie: Perhaps we could ask the clerk to compile that list, and have it added if we agree to that list being what the amendment is, and not have us googling various companies that are selling cars in Canada.

If we could maybe just have that agreement, the clerk could do it himself.

The Chair: Friends, I'm going to ask you to keep that thought in mind.

I'm going to Ms. Miedema.

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): I move that we suspend, please, for a few minutes.

Thank you.

The Chair: We'll suspend.

• (1300)

(Pause)

• (1315)

The Chair: I call the meeting to order.

We're resuming debate.

I was with Mr. St-Pierre who last requested a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. St-Pierre.

Eric St-Pierre: Just very quickly, it would have been nice to have this motion in advance. Maybe it's a suggestion to my colleagues to provide this in advance and not dump it on us at the last minute. Providing bilingual versions would also be very much appreciated.

This doesn't allow us much time to review it. We have some questions as to whether it's a potential violation of the Competition Act or if it's legal.

I don't have much else to comment on, so I will leave it there.

The Chair: [Inaudible—Editor]

Shannon Miedema: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think we don't want to get in the way of the request for this information. It's information we are all very interested in. We're unsure if we'll get it. We're prepared to go to a vote.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Miedema.

Go ahead, Mr. Leslie.

Branden Leslie: That's great, Chair.

Just to my colleague's point, because this may come up again in the future on an entirely different issue, this committee is a sovereign body that can request whatever it wants. We can't compel anything necessarily. There are certain powers, but let's not go down that path just yet. There is zero chance that it is illegal to ask for information. We may not get the details we want. I think it's our best chance at getting any transparency in this space in what is a rather opaque process. I appreciate the willingness to just move to a vote. I just want to assure that it's not illegal to ask for things.

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Lemire, you have the floor.

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): I'd like to point out that there is established consensus for dialogue and that the Bloc Québécois will support it.

The Chair: Before we get to that, it should be noted that the first amendment to include the word “Canadian” has been agreed to.

Let us now turn to the second amendment Ms. Anstey was going to present.

Do we proceed with debate on the second amendment or are we going to have a vote on the motion?

We are going to have a debate on the second amendment.

Ms. Anstey, you have the floor.

[English]

Carol Anstey: I have provided to the clerk a list of all of the companies that manufacture cars in Canada that this would apply to. We've included it. We believe that this would cover any concerns that our Bloc colleague had. I would move that it be the amendment that we would make.

The Chair: Has this second amendment been forwarded to all members?

Go ahead, Mr. St-Pierre.

Eric St-Pierre: I have a clarification question for my colleague, Mrs. Anstey.

Is this section (c)?

Okay, thank you.

The Chair: I'm going to ask the clerk to read section (c), which is an amendment.

[Translation]

And then we can debate it.

You have the floor, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Anstey has proposed the addition of section (c):

that the other major auto manufacturers in Canada, namely Ford, Toyota, Honda, General Motors and Stellantis be also requested to provide the same information.

[English]

In English, it's “that the other major auto manufacturers in Canada, namely Ford, Toyota, Honda, General Motors and Stellantis be also requested to provide the same information”.

[Translation]

That was my understanding.

• (1320)

[English]

The Chair: We have Mrs. Anstey and then Mr. Bexte.

Carol Anstey: No, he said, “all those in favour”.

The Chair: He said it, not me. He's telling me what I should do next.

Is there any further debate?

All those in favour of the amendment proposed by Mrs. Anstey?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're back to the motion.

I'll ask again if there's further debate on the original motion, including the two amendments.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Next is committee business.

Wade Grant: Mr. Chair, I'll move to adjourn.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

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>