



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 011

Wednesday, October 29, 2025

Chair: Ben Carr



Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

Wednesday, October 29, 2025

• (1630)

[English]

The Chair (Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.)): Good afternoon, everybody. Colleagues.

Okay, I know there are lots of side conversations. I appreciate we're always happy to see each other. We have a full couple of hours here and I'd very much like us to get going.

This is the second of the three scheduled meetings for our emergency study on the state of the auto sector with a variety of other specifics around that. We have one witness for the first hour, and several witnesses in the second hour.

We're going to get right into it here. All witnesses have completed the required connection tests in advance of this meeting.

I'll give you a friendly reminder that to protect the health and well-being of our interpreters if your interpretation device is plugged in and not on your ear to please make sure it is on the sticker in front of you.

With that, joining us online today we have Jeff Hines, who is representing Stellantis.

Mr. Hines, I believe you know you have up to five minutes to provide introductory remarks, followed by a line of questioning. There's an allotted amount of time to the recognized political parties around the table that we will follow.

Mr. Hines, the floor is yours.

Jeff Hines (President, Stellantis): Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, everyone. I want to take a few minutes for an opening statement.

Mr. Chair and honourable members of the committee, thanks again for the opportunity to appear before you today.

For a little background on Stellantis, we've been a proud part of Canada's automotive story for more than a century. This is in fact our 100-year anniversary here in Canada. We were born in Windsor on June 17, 1925, just 11 days after the Chrysler Corporation was formed in the U.S.

Since that time, our company and the variations of Stellantis have directly and indirectly created tens of thousands of jobs, supported the Canadian economy from coast to coast and built innovative, dependable vehicles to keep Canadians moving every single day.

Since 2022 and more recently, we've announced \$8.6 billion of Canadian-specific investments. Nearly all of those projects are either complete or well under way. They include the NextStar Energy battery facility in Windsor, major upgrades to the Windsor assembly plant, and enhanced R and D capacity as well, along with \$1 billion earmarked for the Brampton assembly plant retool.

Today, Stellantis employs approximately 9,000 Canadians across our manufacturing plants, our research and development centre, and our business and distribution operations nationwide. Over the past 100 years, we've built more than 25 million vehicles in Canada and have sold them through a network of our more than 144 dealerships today.

We're also proud to be one of the only three automakers in Canada that build more vehicles in Canada than we sell here. That distinction reflects our deep commitment to this country and to its role in our North American manufacturing.

We've had strong productive relationships with our labour unions and all levels of government, and we're certainly grateful for that partnership and the support extended to us during pivotal moments in our history. That collaboration has been instrumental in ensuring that Canada remains a key part of Stellantis's global strategy.

For our dedicated employees and families in Brampton, I want to say this directly to you for those watching. The recent decisions on the Brampton plant were clearly not taken lightly, and we recognize the impact these decisions have had, not only on you but on the community and the families involved. We have robust supports in place to help mitigate the current situation and the effects, and we are offering transfer opportunities to other Stellantis facilities wherever possible and wherever that makes sense for the employees and their families.

Overall, our priority remains the same: long-term stability of our Canadian workforce. While the economic landscape has certainly changed and shifted and is certainly challenging today, the importance of Canada to Stellantis has not. We remain deeply invested in the future of Canadian manufacturing and innovation.

Since 2022, we've added 600 highly skilled engineering jobs at our research and development centre. By early 2026, we'll add approximately 1,500 new Canadian jobs to our Windsor assembly plant as well. At the same time, we continue to work constructively with our government partners, stakeholders and unions as we identify new opportunities for potential new products for Brampton.

As somebody said about the privilege of leading Stellantis Canada, I can tell you this: Our success as a company is tied directly to Canada's success. It's not just a market to us. It's a home. It's built by communities, it's built by our dealers and it's built by our employees and all the communities those folks represent, and they've represented us for generations.

The auto industry has faced challenges before and each time has adapted. It's persevered and it's emerged stronger. I'm confident that the Canadian auto-manufacturing business can do so once again.

In closing, Mr. Chair, I just want to emphasize three key points that I think are important as we move forward.

First, for more than a 100 years, Stellantis has helped shape Canada's automotive industry. That history gives us pride and it gives us purpose, and we want to look forward to the next chapter of building Canadian innovation, Canadian manufacturing and growth across Canada.

Second, with billions of dollars invested, thousands of new jobs under way and major projects that are nearing completion, we are committed to driving lasting economic value and reinforcing Canada's role in the global automotive supply chain.

Third and last, we remain fully engaged in working with government, with labour and with our community partners, working together to ensure a sustainable competitive future for Canadian manufacturing and, more importantly, the people who power it.

• (1635)

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I look forward to the committee's questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Madam Dancho will begin for six minutes.

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Hines, for being with us today.

You are the president of Stellantis Canada, and you were invited to discuss the quite shocking news that Canada received just a few weeks ago. Your company is moving the facility for the production of the Jeep Compass to Illinois in the United States from Brampton. It laid off 3,000 workers and impacted 3,000 families there. In that announcement, your company announced a \$13-billion investment in the United States that will create 5,000 direct jobs and countless more indirect American jobs.

It's very concerning, especially in light of the very considerable subsidy deals that you signed with the Liberal government, among others. I would like to ask you about those contracts, sir.

Just off the top, did any of these agreements that you signed with the Liberal government come with job guarantees that Stellantis would maintain its employment footprint in Canada?

Jeff Hines: What I can tell you is that we are committed to our employees at Brampton and in Canada.

Some of the dynamics of the contract and the contract signed are going to remain confidential, as is the nature of those contracts. We are, however, committed to maintaining the workforce in Canada as best we can.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Hines.

I appreciate that, but I don't believe I'm asking you to reveal anything that's commercially sensitive. I'm just asking if you agreed to take up to—and I can break it down as well—about \$16.5 billion in taxpayer money from agreements with the Liberal government in exchange for, among other things, a Canada-wide jobs guarantee. I don't believe that's commercially sensitive.

Jeff Hines: This is an important point for the committee. The plant is not closed. The workers remain laid off, and our commitment to those workers will remain. We are working through potential possibilities for that plant to get those workers back to work in a way that's commercially viable.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Hines.

I do believe, from what we've understood from previous testimony on Monday, that while you are saying publicly that you do have plans, in fact they are contingent on Canada getting an auto sector deal. Unfortunately, we haven't had any commitment from the Liberal government that an auto deal is imminent or is forthcoming. Really, it just hasn't been communicated that it's something on the near horizon.

My understanding is that there are no plans for Brampton, unless there is an auto deal—a good auto deal—for Canada. Is that not the case?

Jeff Hines: Well, we certainly need some clarity from the trade situation that we have today. It's fluid. I just saw recent announcements over the last week. It's obviously a very fluid situation.

What we need, and what I think the industry needs, collectively, is clearly some stability in trade conversations so that we can adjust and invest accordingly.

• (1640)

Raquel Dancho: Right.

Our understanding is that the Trump administration is very determined on these tariffs. In fact, they've stated this, and I'll paraphrase it. My take-away is that they're looking to bleed Canada's auto sector dry. We are bleeding a lot of auto jobs, and that seems to be their mission. Again, we aren't receiving any confidence from the Liberal government that they're going to deliver an auto deal for Canadians, imminently or on the near horizon.

All things being equal, if the situation you're in today remains the same a year from now, will that Brampton plant be operational?

Jeff Hines: I can't speculate on that hypothetical. We certainly want to work with both sides of the government to come to a solution that maintains jobs, and we want to do the best that we can to keep Canadian jobs, keep Canadian manufacturing and keep our folks at Brampton working with a long-term, sustainable operation. We certainly want that.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Hines.

I'm just going to run through some of the funding commitments that came from the Liberal government, which you are currently receiving.

Over the past three years, Stellantis has received deals worth about \$1 billion in direct capital grants to modernize and to retool your Windsor and Brampton facilities for electric and hybrid vehicles production. There was \$529 million of that commitment from the federal government's strategic innovation fund. To my knowledge, over \$105 million has already flowed to your company.

Further to that, the Liberal government also committed to provide you with support of up to \$500 million, through the SIF as well, for capital expenditures for your NextStar Energy battery plant in Windsor, and \$268 million of that has flowed to you.

Within those agreements—and I'll ask you again—was there a Canada-wide jobs guarantee?

Jeff Hines: There certainly was every effort made to make sure that all of those investments are working.

I'll just go back to what I said originally. We have over 1,000 jobs at our NextStar Energy plant. We have added, or are in the process of adding, 1,500 additional jobs in Windsor.

The folks at Brampton remain as part of our employment, as employees. We want to continue that. That's what we're trying to do.

We certainly want to work with our union colleagues and with the government to make sure we can do that.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you.

I'll ask you again about the NextStar Energy plant and the other subsidy agreement that came from the Liberal government in partnership with the Government of Ontario. That was to be up to \$15 billion. In that agreement, was there a Canada-wide jobs guarantee? I'm pretty keen on this, so I'll ask you again.

Jeff Hines: I would reiterate that we continue to have employment there. It's 1,000 employees today, with plans to add additional workers as the plant expands and the volume of what we do at that plant expands. We certainly have employees there today and more to come.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Hines.

I am a bit concerned because—again, I don't believe it is commercially sensitive information as to whether or not you've committed with up to \$16.5 billion of taxpayer funding and subsidies from the Liberal government and others.... I don't believe it's commercially sensitive to ask and for you to say whether, within any of those multiple agreements, the Liberal government required a

Canada-wide jobs guarantee in exchange for that considerable level of taxpayer funding. I am concerned that you're not saying so, which, to me, seems like there wasn't.

Jeff Hines: We continue to have jobs, and we expand that plant. We continue to expand at our Windsor plant as well. We certainly appreciate all the support we've gotten from both the provincial and federal governments. Certainly, this is also an unusual time, over the last nine months especially. It's certainly more fluid than any of us expected when those contracts were completed.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Hines.

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Dancho.

Madam O'Rourke, you have six minutes.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Thank you, Chair Carr.

Mr. Hines, I certainly hope you're able to keep the commitments you made in your opening statements for Canada and to the auto workers.

You understand, at this really challenging time, when the government is standing with our auto sector and standing with our auto workers, that news that you are moving the Jeep Compass plant from Brampton to Illinois and making substantial investments in the United States is really challenging as we try to fortify our auto sector in light of these unjustified and punishing U.S. tariffs.

I'm going to suggest, sir, that Stellantis's actions are contributing to this instability. I'm going to assume that you don't treat all your contractual obligations this way, despite market changes. A contract is a contract.

You, sir, are on the hook for millions of dollars, and I'd like to know how this is affecting your business decisions.

• (1645)

Jeff Hines: There are a few things I would say there. It's a lot to digest.

Number one is that we would like to get to some clarity on the current economic and trade situation. As you can imagine, it's not a Stellantis-only problem and maybe not an auto-industry-only problem. It's extremely difficult to make investment decisions given the current environment that we're all living in today.

The first thing we'd like to get to is some level of clarity, whether that's through CUSMA or something that's going to get us to some level of understanding of what the current trade environment is going to be, so that we can make the right investment decisions and get back on track here in Canada.

Dominique O'Rourke: That's certainly the objective of the Government of Canada as well. I'm sure you would agree that we want to work with our industry partners and the auto workers to reach that stability, and that every effort is being made to do that.

I want to shift to Brampton for a moment. While the addition of the third shift in Brampton doesn't really release you from any of the contractual obligations, it is welcome. I would be curious to know what the plans are for Brampton.

Jeff Hines: The plans for Brampton, as you can imagine, are a little commercially sensitive. They're something we're not going to discuss publicly. I can tell you that I've seen a couple of different potential options for the plant in Brampton. I think they both make sense for Canada. We look forward to when we get some stability in the current environment. I think it could do good things for the plant and good things for our customers across Canada.

Dominique O'Rourke: I am curious to know whether or not you worked with the government prior to making this announcement and whether there was consultation with Unifor or the auto workers. How did you arrive at this surprising conclusion?

Jeff Hines: We've had consistent conversation with a lot of stakeholders over the past nine months. Certainly, as some of the communication has gone, some was commercially sensitive, which we were unable to share. Some we did share. We have had communication with all levels of government, especially over the last nine months.

I would say that some of our challenge was with the direct conversation we had with our Brampton workforce. It's a difficult message to deliver, and I'm sure it was even harder to receive when we made that announcement a few weeks back. There is a lot of empathy for our workers in that situation, but we did have numerous conversations through all levels of government over the last six to nine months.

Dominique O'Rourke: That's great.

I have a last question, Mr. Hines. Clearly, everyone's been rocked by these unfair, unjustified tariffs from the United States over the last nine months. Going back in history, going back five years, how would you describe the soundness of these investments because of the quality of our workforce and because of the quality of Canadian automakers? Would you say that these investments were in line with global trends and that they were contributing to the efficiency of the production facilities?

Jeff Hines: I would say that they were a large part of the former FCA, going back five years ago, and now Stellantis. They were a large part of our operations and a great workforce across our Canadian footprint. They were a big part of our success over the last five years and much longer than that, as I've said. It's a certain element of Canada that's been a great big part of our collective business over many years.

Dominique O'Rourke: Do you have an idea of the timeline of when we will be able to hear what's next for Brampton, to give those families some hope?

Jeff Hines: I wish I could give a definitive timeline, but as you can imagine, the situation today is so fluid. With the uncertainty in regard to our current trade situation and our current economic environment, I cannot give a timeline of when that would happen. I do

know this: The sooner we can come to some clarity on the trade situation and the current economic environment that we're all living in, the sooner we can make those announcements and the sooner we can work with that plan with our union colleagues, our workers at Brampton and the federal government as well.

Dominique O'Rourke: I certainly hope we can count on you to stay in Canada, sir, and to continue to create opportunities for auto workers.

The Chair: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ste-Marie, you have the floor for six minutes.

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, Mr. Hines. Thank you very much for your participation in this very important study that our committee is undertaking.

Make no mistake: We are very concerned. U.S. President Donald Trump says he wants to move auto manufacturing jobs back to the United States. He's doing so by imposing tariffs and waging a trade war. At the same time, we've learned that your company is going to move production of the Jeep Compass model from Ontario to Illinois. We've also learned that you're going to invest billions of dollars in the United States. As parliamentarians, we're concerned about the erosion of the auto industry in Canada and in Ontario.

When did you inform the Canadian government of your decision to move production of the Jeep Compass model from Ontario to Illinois?

• (1650)

[*English*]

Jeff Hines: The official announcement to the Canadian government was done at about the same time we announced to the world. It was done slightly prior to that. I will say that we did have additional conversations on some of the challenges we faced across the board, going back many months prior.

To go back to your comments on the commitment to Ontario and the commitment to the Canadian automotive footprint, we want to be in Canada. We have had a great, strong history in Canada. We've added roughly 2,500 jobs between what we have done coming in at Windsor and what we've done with our battery plant as well. Then there's the additional engineering jobs that we brought to our research and development side here.

We are committed to Canada. We want to maintain our presence in Canada. We have a great history, and we want to continue to build on that history.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Can you guarantee, here and now, that Stellantis won't reduce its operations or its number of employees in Canada?

[English]

Jeff Hines: What I can say is this: We are fully committed to Canada. That's why we're going through hiring processes now for the additional jobs in Windsor that I mentioned. The production there will start in February, so it's not that far away. We are committed to continuing that expansion. We are committed to working and expanding our battery plant. We are committed to Canada, and we want to continue to do that. Given the uncertainty of the trade situation today, it's obviously a very fluid situation that we're all dealing with, but we would like to, we want to, continue our expansions and our business in Canada.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you for your answer, but I have to say that it worries me a great deal.

I understand that many businesses are facing uncertainty in the current economic climate, including the automotive industry. You want to continue your activities, and you'd like the number of jobs to be maintained or increased, as was estimated or forecasted, but today, you aren't able to tell us that you'll maintain the same level of activity, jobs and growth. That's what I understand from your answer. Obviously, I think that should concern all my colleagues here.

In terms of the project—

[English]

Jeff Hines: To be clear, we are looking only at expanding. That's why the additional jobs that I just mentioned...we're working through. We are not looking to shrink our footprint. In fact, it's quite the opposite, with the addition of the 1,500 jobs and a third shift at Windsor. We're not doing that for the short term: We want to maintain that for the long term. We're looking increase our employee footprint from what we have today.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you for those clarifications; that's more reassuring.

Regarding the plan to build the Jeep Compass model in Ontario, how much public assistance was allocated or what incentives were promised by the federal government to upgrade the Brampton plant? How do you assess the impact of this relocation on federal government investments? What happened to what was promised?

[English]

Jeff Hines: What we are working towards and want to continue to work and collaborate on, with both our union colleagues and the government, is a way forward at Brampton that meets the commitments we all collectively made and has the potential to be a product—which would not be the Jeep Compass, as was originally planned, that's true, but something else—that we think would fit the current environment better than the Jeep Compass would today.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: What were the main factors that led you to move production of the Jeep Compass model to the United States?

• (1655)

[English]

Jeff Hines: It's clear, from our comments, that it's an important segment for North America. It's a large segment, both in Canada and the U.S., and it's something...that we need to get a new product to market in as quickly as we can. The current situation that we are all faced with, and the uncertainty and the changing market dynamics that have happened over the last nine months made that very challenging and difficult, to say the least. Those are the reasons that the company made that decision.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: I have one last very quick question for you, at least in this round of questions.

Had it not been for Donald Trump's tariffs and trade war, would the Jeep Compass model have been produced in Brampton?

[English]

Jeff Hines: I think there are a lot of market dynamics at play that impacted not only that but the industry in total. Certainly, there were multiple dynamics that did have a large impact. The current situation certainly had an impact.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[English]

Ms. Borrelli, you have five minutes..

Kathy Borrelli (Windsor—Tecumseh—Lakeshore, CPC): Chair, before I begin my line of questioning, I'd like to state something for the record. Hours before the official announcement that Stellantis would move production from the Brampton plant to Illinois, the company made robocalls to their employees, informing them that they'd be laid off. These employees, who grew that business and stood by the company, were treated in one of the most shockingly inhumane ways I have ever heard of. For the benefit of this committee and of my colleagues across the table, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to play the robocall that was sent to the employees in Brampton.

The Chair: Ms. Borrelli, I'll stop the clock for a moment. The challenge with this is that, unless you have appropriate translation that's been provided in advance and an opportunity for members to hear the video or the audio that you're referencing, it makes it quite challenging. I have to uphold respect for both official languages, first and foremost. I'm not sure that the quality of that audio, without having tested it, is going to be something we can work with.

I might recommend that, should that be of importance to your moving forward, it's a conversation you can have with our colleagues around the table. If there is agreement to move forward with it, then we would take the necessary steps in order to ensure that it were brought to the quality that's necessary.

Is this on a point of order, Madam Dancho?

Raquel Dancho: Yes. We do have a translated copy of the transcript, so we can provide that to the committee members right now. Again, I think this is to make the point that the president hears what the workers had to hear, Mr. Chair. It's a fairly simple audio. I think the workers would appreciate the president and the members of this committee knowing what was said to them when they were laid off, when 3,000 families heard that news. I would ask just you to reconsider. We have the French transcripts that we can provide to everyone. I think it would do right by workers to ensure that this is on the record.

The Chair: Just give me one minute to confer with the clerk. It's an unusual request. That, in and of itself, doesn't mean that I have to close the door on it, but I need to confer.

My position on this, from the chair's perspective, is that I'm not comfortable with having an audio or video I have not heard or seen, nor the recorded transcript and translation to French.

Having said that, you've asked to seek unanimous consent, so should it be the will of the committee, I'll cede to the will of the committee.

My own view, as just mentioned, is that I have some challenges with this. However, granted that you've sought that unanimous consent, I will look around the table.

This is little bit unconventional. Ms. Borrelli, this is going to eat into your line of questioning. I can't give you your time back.

I'm going to pause here just for a moment in the event that a member wishes to speak to this. Again, this is very unconventional. However, in the spirit of collaboration, I'm willing to grant some time here.

Did you want to speak to this?

• (1700)

Karim Bardeesy (Taiiako'n—Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Yes, I'll speak to this.

I think I'd be happy, as a member of this committee, to have the transcript read into the record. I think that's an appropriate thing to do.

The Chair: Then you're not giving unanimous consent for it to be played.

Karim Bardeesy: No.

The Chair: Unanimous consent has not been given, in which case, Ms. Borrelli, I'm going to afford you a moment to ask a question and I'll try to be reasonable here.

Raquel Dancho: She only did a minute of her time.

The Chair: Sorry, do you have a point of order, Madam Dancho?

Raquel Dancho: Yes.

My understanding is, Mr. Chair, that she only did less than a minute of her time and we've been on this UC thing since then. She should have about four minutes—

The Chair: Yes, I'm going to give a little bit of time here. This is not a legitimate point of order. I have entertained this to try to be reasonable.

Ms. Borrelli, begin with your line of questioning. I'm not going to cut you off at any particular moment that's not reasonable. Just go ahead, but I can't grant you the entirety of it.

Go ahead.

Kathy Borrelli: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Basically, going through this, we can pass around what the robocall said.

First, in the robocall, they talk about the \$13 billion they're going to invest in the States before they even tell the employees that they're cutting them off and they won't have their jobs. These are employees who have already been on layoff for two years and are expecting to go back to work. They're telling them that they're indefinitely laid off now.

Mr. Hines, is it common practice for your company to inform employees by robocall that they no longer have a future in your company?

Jeff Hines: First off, I would say there is still a future, there is still potential and there is some opportunity for all of our employees at Brampton. In the short term, it's making all the opportunities and all the available additional jobs at Windsor...if that fits for that family or that employee who is currently laid off at Brampton. We are working with our union colleagues to extend benefits to those folks for a longer period of time than was originally provided in the contract. We want to try to take care of those employees.

Certainly, I can understand and appreciate the frustration of the employees and of yourself in how it was done. Certainly it's a challenging message, at the very least. We want to try to do what we can for those employees, moving forward.

Kathy Borrelli: Mr. Hines, unemployment benefits are meant for a short term. Years and years of unemployment benefits do not pay the mortgage and do not put food on the table, so I hope those workers in Brampton get back to work really fast.

In addition, for 100 years, workers in Windsor have depended on the work available at the assembly plant. That plant provides stable income for my community. In my community, 24,000 workers depend on the auto industry for jobs that are safe and provide well for their families.

This would include the third shift, which was recently added to your plant. Will you assure workers in the Windsor area that their jobs are secure? Do you intend to maintain your footprint in Windsor and in Canada?

Jeff Hines: That is fully our intention, and we're excited to bring on 1,500 new workers. We're excited to bring the capacity of that plant to the 200,000, 210,000, 220,000 units that we're going to build in Canada each and every year. We're excited about getting those employees and having that plant build even more than it does today.

• (1705)

Kathy Borrelli: I'm really glad to hear that. Thank you.

You promised my community that the NextStar battery plant would create 2,500 direct jobs.

Is that still the number? When will you reach that number of employment at that plant?

Jeff Hines: As I mentioned before, we're at roughly 1,000 today. The number continues to grow.

I think the market dynamics across the North American market, as well as in Canada, have shifted a little bit. That's something we're taking into account, but our plans are to continue to expand at NextStar, expand some of the capability at the plant and continue our progress there.

Kathy Borrelli: That's good to hear, but I believe you had a commitment to provide 2,500 jobs within a year of opening the plant. Is that not true?

Jeff Hines: I don't have the timing in front of me, so I cannot answer that question. That was a year from the time that it opened. I apologize.

I do know that we continue to expand, and, as I said, we want to continue to expand. Our collective investment there is large, and we want to make sure that it continues.

Kathy Borrelli: Thank you so much.

Are you telling me that Canadians can trust that you're going to be finding a new product to bring to Brampton and that you're going to continue your footprint across Canada and grow your factories in Brampton and in Windsor?

Jeff Hines: I certainly have stated that. The first step in adding jobs across Canada is the 1,500 that are coming to Windsor. That's ongoing, and we're excited about that, but I will be clear that we need the market dynamics to settle down. We need some consistency in our trade policy moving forward. That's what we really need for step one, so that we can do all those things and continue what you just mentioned.

However, we are adding 1,500 jobs. We're very excited about that and we can't wait to get going.

Kathy Borrelli: My community is depending on you to keep your word.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Erskine-Smith, you have five minutes.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Thanks, Chair.

You mentioned in your opening remarks, and I think I have it right, that "It's not just a market to us. It's a home." That's what you said when you were talking about Canada.

You've been a little bit high-level, a little bit vague. You talked about economic landscape change, an unusual time, a fluid situation.

Maybe you can be a bit more specific. Tell me about the market decision to abandon thousands of workers in your home at the

worst possible time, when our auto sector's under attack. Walk me through that in greater detail.

Jeff Hines: Let me digest that for a second.

It was certainly a decision that was not taken lightly by anyone at Stellantis or anyone locally here in Canada. It was certainly a challenging decision to make.

With the current tariff situation and the unknowns that the current market has given, not only Stellantis and auto manufacturing but also the historic partnerships that we've had for products that we make are certainly challenged in today's environment. That is primarily what led us to make some of the decisions that we had to make.

That said—

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: I have to jump in there, because as of February 2025, the retooling is paused, and your company made a public statement saying, "This does not change our previously announced investment plans for Brampton."

Less than a year later, things have drastically changed, and you walked away from that commitment. Can you explain that?

Jeff Hines: Certainly. What happened between then and the time that we made our announcement is the economic uncertainty of our trade policy today. That's primarily number one.

We certainly—

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: You've been very clear.

In a previous answer to a Bloc member's question, you said there were lots of different factors, but it's the tariffs. Let's be honest with ourselves; it's the tariffs.

Earlier you—

Jeff Hines: Certainly, in large part.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Yes, 100%.

You said Canada's your home and that you're a "proud part of Canada's automotive story".

Can you be clear and tell me what you think about the tariffs? Should President Trump rescind the tariffs? Should he stop his attacks on Canada? Are the tariffs against our auto sector a bad idea?

Jeff Hines: I would say this: From our perspective, clearly, clarity on trade policy helps us invest in the short term, mid term and long term.

The unknown—

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Forget about clarity for a moment. You said you're a "proud part of Canada's automotive story" and you want to be a big part of our future. You said that Canada is "not just a market...it's a home."

It should be easy to say tariffs on Canada's auto sector are a terrible idea.

Can you say it with me?

• (1710)

Jeff Hines: What I will say is my own words, not yours, if you'd be so kind to allow me to continue and say my own. I do think Canada is our home. We have been here for 100 years. We are continuing to invest in Canada and want to continue to do so.

Certainly, we want a policy that works for our manufacturing footprint in Canada so we can continue to grow and continue to expand.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Let's talk about a policy that would support workers in Brampton.

You said you're "committed to...employees at Brampton". You said that just today. In answers to other questions, you've said that you've seen a couple of options you can't disclose with any specificity.

Give me a timeline. When can workers expect you to honour your commitments?

Jeff Hines: It goes back to when we have economic certainty. When we have trade certainty, it certainly allows us to make an informed decision.

Right now, we don't have that trade certainty, and it's not just a Stellantis concern—

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: It sounds like the commitment is contingent on something entirely out of your control. It doesn't sound like a firm commitment at all.

Hundreds of millions of federal dollars—before even talking about provincial dollars in Ontario—have been committed to that Brampton facility. Specifically, over \$100 million has actually flowed.

What do you see as your obligations to the Canadian taxpayer and to the public?

Jeff Hines: I'm clearly appreciative of all the support we've gotten from both the Canadian government and the Ontario provincial government.

Our idea, our plan and our strategy—

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Your obligation is appreciation?

What do you see as your obligation to the Brampton facility based on taxpayer dollars? I don't care if you appreciate it. What's your obligation?

Jeff Hines: We want to make sure that we provide for those employees. That's what I mentioned earlier. We want to give them the first chance to go to Windsor. That's a new employment opportunity they can take advantage of.

In the short term, while we have such uncertainty today, we want to try to continue the benefits they've accumulated. No, it's not the same as they would have at the Windsor opportunity; we want to try to take care of the employees as best we can, but we need some economic certainty in order to make those decisions.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: As we wait for economic certainty, can we expect you to repay the money?

Jeff Hines: We're certainly committed to helping our employees as best we can. We want to continue with all of the commitments that we've made. It starts with getting something that works in the trade so we can continue to expand at Brampton and continue the other expansion that I mentioned earlier.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: What I have heard, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that Canada's your home, but you're abandoning thousands of workers.

What I've heard is you've accepted hundreds of millions of dollars in commitments, including over \$100 million specifically that has flowed for Brampton, but you have no intention of honouring your commitments to workers there except with some vague possibility of jobs once you get economic certainty, and you won't say that tariffs on the auto sector here in Canada are a bad idea.

Jeff Hines: It's certainly economically challenging; there's no doubt. Again, it's not just Stellantis. It's the industry in total.

We certainly need to come to some resolution sooner rather than later. We do want to make sure we help our employees and talk about the commitments we made to them, and we want to continue with the potential of additional products that, in my mind, could work better than the previous plan.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Thanks.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Ste-Marie, you have the floor for two and a half minutes.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Hines, did Stellantis sign an agreement with the union that it would commit to producing the Jeep Compass model at the Brampton plant?

[*English*]

Jeff Hines: Originally, the plan was to produce the Jeep Compass. That was the plan.

Obviously, given the market dynamics that really started nine months ago or so, it's very challenging to bring that to market, and that's why the adjustments were made.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: I'll ask my question again.

Did you sign an agreement with the union in 2023 regarding the assembly of the Jeep Compass model in Brampton?

[*English*]

Jeff Hines: The original agreement was to build a Jeep Compass at the Brampton facility.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you for that clarification.

As you told us, it was the changes in the situation, the tariffs and the overall situation that caused you to change your decision.

If conditions changed, if the U.S. president suspended his tariffs or if they were overturned by the U.S. courts, would you reverse your decision so that the Jeep Compass model could be built at the Brampton plant?

• (1715)

[*English*]

Jeff Hines: We fully support some level of certainty from a trade front. That would be welcome news to not only Stellantis but the auto industry in general, and obviously the Canadian auto industry in total.

We want to continue our expansion of Brampton as we committed to. As it stands today, I think the other products that I mentioned as possibilities are a better fit for Canada and a better fit for Brampton than what we had previously. But the first thing we need—and I'll go back to it again—is some trade certainty and some level of agreement, so we can continue to move forward.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: It's very clear; we agree on that.

Does the U.S. site offer Stellantis any new incentives, subsidies or possible deductions? Does the State of Illinois or the federal government provide any benefits to Stellantis for the assembly of the Jeep Compass model?

[*English*]

Jeff Hines: I have not seen those agreements. Again, I'm here in Canada, so I can't answer that question. Respectfully, if I could, I would, but I don't have that answer.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: If you are able to verify the information with your American colleagues, could you provide us with an answer in writing? We would appreciate that.

I think that's my time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*English*]

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

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Hines, for your testimony here at committee today.

As you can see, we're very concerned about the 3,000 workers who received that robocall, and are finding themselves on an extended layoff with no certainty as to when they're going to be returning to work.

Certainly some of the phrases that you've used continually in your remarks and your responses have been “market dynamics”, “unknowns”, “uncertainty”. Can you help me understand a little bit what you mean by that? You've identified trade tariffs that are ongoing with the United States' challenges, but can you identify any other unknowns or market dynamics?

Jeff Hines: The number one challenge that we have to overcome today is to come to some level of agreement, and that will give us some certainty. We need something in Brampton that's commercially viable. We want to have something in Brampton that works for Canada and for Canadian customers, but we also need it to work for customers outside Canada today as well. That's number one. If we can get that and get to some level of agreement, we all think that there's great opportunity for our Brampton employees to get back to work.

Ted Falk: A company like Stellantis doesn't make a decision overnight to spend \$13 billion on a plant in Illinois, and to temporarily abandon the Brampton facility. You've obviously been in touch and communicating with Unifor and the Government of Canada. On what date did those discussions begin on the possible extended closure?

Jeff Hines: I won't get into specifics, but I think some of those are, again, commercially important for us. I would say that we've had conversations over the last nine months, and certainly some of the challenges...our expectations, I think, over the last nine months, are that we'd be in a better spot than we are today from an agreement—

Ted Falk: Mr. Hines, some of these discussions that the Brampton plant would continue to remain dormant have been ongoing with the Government of Canada for the past nine months.

Jeff Hines: No, the conversation with the government has been consistent over the past nine months in regard to the challenges that the current tariff situation brings to us going forward. As you can imagine, at a large company like Stellantis, we look at a lot of different options, a lot of ways to go, and a lot of things that are reviewed—

Ted Falk: You've been communicating regularly with our government over the past nine months about some of the challenges you're facing and the options you're looking at.

Jeff Hines: Yes, we have.

Ted Falk: Okay, thank you.

Some of the previous witnesses we've had at committee here for this study have indicated that one of the uncertainties you're probably talking about is the fact that our EV mandate has only been paused. I sit on our Conservative auto caucus, and we've had a presentation from industry there before, and they've said that the mandate has created a real challenge for you as manufacturers.

How much did that play into your decision? President Trump removed that mandate, and here you're still faced with that mandate.

• (1720)

Jeff Hines: That's an excellent question. I'll make a few comments as I digest your question.

We are one of, if not the only, manufacturer that builds an electric vehicle in Canada. We also build traditional ICE vehicles here as well. What we believe in is freedom of choice for the customer, so we do support the pause on the ZEV mandate. We think customers need to be able to choose what they like and choose what they want. That said—

Ted Falk: Doesn't the pause just create uncertainty for you?

Jeff Hines: That said, we build electric vehicles here in Canada, we build ICE vehicles here in Canada, and we want to give our customers across Canada the choice they want to make.

Ted Falk: We've heard from previous testimony that demand has dropped to 8%. Is that consistent with your sales?

Jeff Hines: That is consistent.

Ted Falk: Some have used the word “tanked”.

If you had a choice today based on what the customer, the consumer is asking for, what kind of vehicle would you be building?

Jeff Hines: What we want to build for the Canadian customer is something that provides great value and great dependability, something that fits their lifestyle needs and something that works across all of Canada. That's—

Ted Falk: Is that a gas-powered vehicle?

Jeff Hines: It could be a gas-powered vehicle. It very well could be.

As you mentioned before, 90-plus per cent today are gas-powered vehicles, and that's the vast majority of the market today.

Ted Falk: From my knowledge, you could have sold a lot more Challenger 170s had you built them.

Jeff Hines: It's a beautiful product.

Ted Falk: Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Sidhu, the floor is yours for five minutes.

Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As a Bramptonian and the member of Parliament for Brampton South, I'm deeply disturbed by this Stellantis decision, Mr. Hines.

When you said that you're committed to Canada, you're committed to Canadians as well.

Through you, Mr. Chair, I would ask Mr. Hines to share what he has to say to my Bramptonians who are losing their jobs, auto workers and their families. What do you want to say when you said that you are committed to Canada and committed to your home?

Jeff Hines: I would say directly to the Brampton employees that it is certainly a challenging message to deliver and even harder, probably, to receive, for sure.

We want to first offer them employment opportunities. They get first choice at these additional Windsor jobs. That may work or may not work for some. We would offer first choice to them directly.

Second, in the short term, we'll provide additional benefits and extend the benefits they receive today. Clearly, from your comments earlier and from the committee, we want to make sure we do that.

The last thing I would say to them is that we want to continue to build vehicles in Brampton, and we want to bring something that's going to work, but we need an environment that allows us to do that.

Sonia Sidhu: Will Stellantis commit to maintaining a manufacturing presence in Brampton? I want to know.

When you're asking for relocation, are you paying for relocation or supporting the workers in their new role? Do you know that it's not right, Mr. Hines, to ask them to relocate? There are 3,000 workers who are there in the plant day in and day out. They work hard for your plant. Is that fair for them?

Jeff Hines: It's certainly challenging. It's certainly something that may not work for all the employees who are there. At the same time, if that does work, we're working with our union colleagues to work on what a relocation for one of the Brampton employees looks like and how we can make that work for them.

Clearly, it's a challenging time for our Brampton workers.

Sonia Sidhu: Finally, Mr. Hines, I want to say that you should honour those Bramptonian auto workers who built your company's reputation.

Thank you.

I want to pass the rest of my time to Mr. Bardeesy.

Karim Bardeesy: Thank you.

Just to follow up on that question, will relocation assistance be made available by the company for those workers who seek to apply for and get those jobs in Windsor?

Jeff Hines: It's something that we're working through with our union colleagues, but we want to support them in their move. We certainly do.

Karim Bardeesy: How many transfer openings are currently available?

• (1725)

Jeff Hines: Right now we have interest from between 100 to 200 of the Brampton employees. If they continue to expand, we'll make those jobs available as necessary.

Karim Bardeesy: Is the Brampton plant a productive plant in the Stellantis family of plants?

Jeff Hines: Historically, Brampton has been a great plant. It's been a very quality plant. That's why we want to get to a situation where we can get back to building vehicles at Brampton under an environment and a trade policy that make those vehicles viable. We want to get back to work. We want our employees back to work.

Karim Bardeesy: In her letter to Mr. Filosa, Minister Joly wrote, “It is imperative that you extend the worker's transition program, agreed to with Unifor, until at least 2027.”

What is the state of that workers' transition program?

Jeff Hines: We want to continue to support our workers in this challenging time. We're working through that with our union colleagues as we speak. We certainly want to try to take care of the employees as best we can moving forward, and support what you said.

Karim Bardeesy: I want to pick up on some of the questions of my colleague Mr. Erskine-Smith with relation to tariffs. I know that you're not in this capacity anymore as Stellantis Canada president, but when you were in that capacity, did you advocate to U.S. officials in Canada around the necessity of getting to a deal that minimized tariffs?

Jeff Hines: That's been a consistent point of conversation with the government. That's something we need. I think the industry needs it. Again, I think it's not just a Stellantis concern. We need to come to an agreement so that we can all move forward.

Karim Bardeesy: More specifically, have you advocated to the U.S. ambassador to Canada that we need to have an expedited deal with minimal to no tariffs?

Jeff Hines: We've had a consistent conversation on that throughout all levels of government.

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

Mr. Ste-Marie, go ahead, please.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. I'd like to come back to what was discussed a little earlier regarding the showing of a video. I think it would have been appropriate to show it, but I fully understand your comments and Mr. Bardeesy's comments about ensuring that French-speaking elected officials have the same rights as English-speaking elected officials.

Mr. Chair, I would suggest that you and my colleagues plan ahead next time to make sure that a translation is available for the interpreters. That would protect the hearing of our interpreters and make the committee more efficient.

I understand that interventions were made to defend the rights of French-speaking elected officials, but I would still have liked all of that to be done in advance. That way, we could have gotten a response from the president of Stellantis Canada to this video.

I'm saying this for next time, I guess.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[English]

Madam O'Rourke, is this on the same point of order?

[Translation]

Dominique O'Rourke: Yes, Mr. Chair.

I agree: It's important to respect official languages.

[English]

Clearly, it's important to be able to respect the official languages status of this committee.

I would also invite Ms. Borrelli to submit the transcript in English and in French so that it can actually be part of the record of

these hearings and be part of the proceedings and the consideration going forward. I think we need to be cautious about playing just any random clip from social media without having it screened through the chair. It's a good discussion to have in terms of a governance conversation. Certainly, nobody wants to hear about a job loss that way. It's tragic. It's really devastating for the families.

In terms of this committee and the transparency, there's no concern about the content but rather the way in which it was brought to committee that I think we can work through for the future. Certainly, feel welcome to submit it through our regular process. People send letters to committee all the time and are treated as a witness.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you for raising that as a point of order.

[English]

Thank you for that.

Just as we conclude the first hour here I will clarify again that of course, Ms. Borrelli, you are certainly welcome to provide for the record of the committee the transcript in both official languages.

Colleagues, this is perhaps just an opportune moment to remind everybody that we have an obligation, it is not a courtesy it is an obligation, to provide in both official languages all documents. We usually ask for this when for example a motion is being put forward on the floor, unless it's something that's happening spontaneously like a subamendment.

It makes my life easier. It makes the clerk's life easier. It makes the analysts' life easier. Perhaps most importantly it makes life easier for the interpreters. Can we do our best moving forward? As a general practice, if we intend to bring something to the floor of the committee, we provide it to the clerk or myself in advance in both official languages so that we aren't getting into a debate about content but we're making sure that the technical administration is upheld.

Having said that, Mr. Hines, thank you for appearing before us today.

Colleagues, we're going to suspend and we will head into the second hour in a few moments.

• (1730) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1738)

• (1735)

The Chair: Colleagues, we are going to get into the second hour of questioning here. We've turned over witnesses, so I will just repeat, for those who may not have been here, that this is the second hour in the second meeting of our conversation in relation to the extenuating circumstances facing Canada's auto sector—Stellantis specifically—and then the broader conditions facing the industry around that.

For witnesses who are joining us here in the room, please make sure that your earpiece is on the sticker in front of you if it's not on your ear. Otherwise, you should be good to go. All witnesses have completed the required connection tests in advance of these meetings.

Colleagues, we have three witnesses with us here today. Joining virtually from the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association, we have Flavio Volpe, president. From Unifor, we have Lana Payne, national president, and Angelo DiCaro, director of research.

Mr. Volpe, I'm going to turn the floor over to you for your introductory remarks.

• (1740)

Flavio Volpe (President, Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association): Thank you, Chair and members.

I'm always happy to be invited and to be a part of the dialogue at this committee.

The Canadian automotive business is anchored in assembly. Some commentators this week, including the Business Council of Canada, have said that we can survive the current tariff war with the Americans because there will always be a market for automotive parts, and we can give up our fight, if need be, on automotive assembly.

I represent those suppliers, the over 200 companies that manufacture 95% of the independent parts production in Canada. I'll say that we completely disagree with that assessment. Fifty per cent of the parts made in Canadian factories go into Canadian vehicle assembly.

We've seen the bad news over the last couple of weeks, where we have had a discontinuation of production at plants in both Brampton and Ingersoll. In my opinion, it's probably a precursor to permanent closures there because as those assembly opportunities in Canada leave, so does the strength of the foundation for the Canadian auto parts sector.

The parts sector has never asked for handouts. There is a lot of dialogue in and around the automotive discussion to say that these are companies that always need to be supported by the Canadian government, and we're disappointed frequently. Auto parts suppliers have always said that if we anchor assembly opportunities here, they'll work out selling to their customers.

In asking government to focus on assembly, we're also employing 100,000 Canadians to make parts of cars, tools for cars and systems that go into those cars. Those are Canadian entities' or foreign entities' Canadian investments for those Canadian assemblies.

Stellantis is a 100-year partner in Canadian automotive. Of course, it started as Chrysler, Dodge, then DaimlerChrysler, then Fiat Chrysler, and now as Stellantis. The best path forward for that 100-year partnership is to get another product in Brampton to also partner with that product in Windsor.

We heavily support, as APMA, the EV investment in Windsor and the R and D facility in Windsor, but we always said that it has to include an absolute guarantee of assembly in Brampton.

We heard in the last session the angst with which the industry has faced this EV mandate. We've been very clear, front and centre, on realism, on setting the pace of EV adoption in Canada. Most of you have heard me quoted widely as saying that we're never going to make the 100% in 2035, but we should find a pace that works for those companies that co-invested with us and maybe stretch those a little bit, but it could also be realistic.

The White House has taken aim at the sector. It has stripped incentives for American buyers and production subsidies for the companies that are in the space, and it has also hit us with illegal and unprecedented tariffs, hoping, reportedly in the President's words, to end production of vehicles in Canada.

I've spent 20 years in this space advocating for investment in Canadian automotive, and in Ontario, I personally worked with Fiat, pursuing investment in Canada in 2006 and 2007. I then worked directly on the restructuring of DaimlerChrysler in the financial crisis of 2009 and 2010 to pursue new programs, together with their great Canadian leader, Sergio Marchionne, from 2015 to 2020. We then supported, again, the NextStar battery Windsor assembly plant and the Brampton assembly plant investments in 2022 and 2023.

I don't get paid by OEMs. They're not our customers. I only work in the interests of the Canadian suppliers. Most of the time, our interests align with the OEMs, and I'm not shy to say that when it works.

In those hard-fought investments over the last three years, I've spent a lot of time advocating for the math in those investments and in those plants for the suppliers and for the 100,000 workers we employ in those supplier firms. I'm also not shy to say when it isn't true. The companies—Stellantis and, of course, General Motors—have choices that they made, which favoured the U.S.

• (1745)

They are all big boys and girls. There are consequences to those decisions, and they need to defend them—here at committee, in the public sphere and to their workers. They can put products in those plants. They should put products in those plants. They're obligated to put products in those plants. The Canadian taxpayer base, including the companies I represent that pay those taxes that help to make those investments true, need those investments to be whole. The people who show up at work every day and go home every day past television cameras—who didn't sign up to be politicians but are simply hard-working auto workers who have mouths to feed and bills to pay—have obligations that need to be met here.

We have all invested over 100 years in a partnership that should be more reliable than nine months of angst from the White House.

Finally, I'll speak personally on Brampton. I bought a 2005 Chrysler 300C, a 2006 Chrysler 300 SRT8, a 2010 Charger SRT8, a 2018 Challenger Demon and a 2022 Challenger Demon 170. I drive and buy the product that I said the best suppliers in the world and the best workers in the world put together. So, not just in my role as the president of the APMA but also as a consumer, I'd like those companies to keep up their end of the bargain or face the consequences.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Volpe.

Ms. Payne, the floor is yours for up to five minutes.

Lana Payne (National President, Unifor): Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Chairman Carr and members of the committee. I really appreciate this invitation, and I also appreciate that you let Flavio go before me, because I needed a bit of time for my blood pressure to come down after your previous testimony.

As you all know, my name is Lana Payne, and I'm the national president of Unifor, Canada's largest private sector union. We represent 320,000 workers in 25-plus sectors of the economy, including 40,000 in the auto sector—and we are Canada's auto union.

As you know, this past week has delivered devastating news to tens of thousands of workers, both in Canadian assembly plants and across the supply chain. All of this, of course, is tied to Donald Trump's trade war. I'd like you to consider this: In the past 15 days our union has received news that Quebec's Paccar plant would reduce production at its Sainte-Thérèse facility, just as new, heavy truck tariffs are set to hit on November 1. This brings the total number of layoffs, at that plant this year, to 775.

General Motors ended its BrightDrop electric delivery van program, leaving 1,100 workers indefinitely out of work. As of today, there is no announced replacement vehicle program for Ingersoll, although we, as a union, are very committed to working with the company on a new product and future for that plant.

Stellantis, as you all know, moved its promised and committed Jeep Compass vehicle program, which also includes the platform for that program, from Brampton to the United States, putting the future of this 3,000-worker facility at risk. This, of course, is in addition to the planned elimination of GM Oshawa's third shift, scheduled for January, as well as numerous auto parts plant closures that we are also currently dealing with as a union.

Let's not forget that what's happening in the auto sector is also happening in steel mills; in pulp, paper and sawmills; in aluminum fabrication plants; and to furniture makers—critical value-added industries in Canada, all suffering losses. It's brutal out there right now for working people, and I need this committee to understand this. Our industrial economy is in a major crisis, and we must do everything in our power to save it. Our entire trade strategy right now must be in defence of it and the more than two million Canadians whose lives and jobs depend on it.

Now, in the time I have left, I want to talk about Brampton and Stellantis, the reason you asked me to appear here today. In 2023, our union negotiated a commitment with that company, clear as day, in black and white. The Jeep Compass program was coming to Brampton. In fact, 3,000 Unifor members ratified a collective agreement on that promise of the program coming to Brampton

and, when ratifying that agreement, they knew that they would be out of work for a considerable period of time during the retool.

I understand that very few of us could have foreseen, in 2023, the disaster of a second Trump presidency and the weaponization of tariffs. I get it. This is all hard for everybody right now, but I'm going to be clear about something: It doesn't matter because commitments were made to workers, our union, this government and the people of Canada, and a deal is a deal.

I want to say, for the record, that our union was blindsided by this decision. For eight months since the Brampton plant retooling was paused, our union sought assurances. We demanded answers from the company because our members deserve answers. If a plan needed to change, then we could discuss it, problem-solve and find ways to make it work, because we always do. All we ever received from Stellantis during that period were false reassurances.

● (1750)

We were told in no uncertain terms that Stellantis was committed to Brampton and committed to the program. We were told over and over again. We were told this right to the very end when apparently Stellantis, at that time, was no longer committed.

You have to understand that to our members, this is a betrayal of the highest magnitude. To our membership, their collective agreement has now been violated and broken. Three thousand workers, 3,000 families and an entire community were strung along for eight long months. That plant has been retooling and those workers have been without work since January 2024.

Stellantis says now that it wants to move quickly to get the Compass built and into showrooms, yet by moving the program to the United States, it will only delay its production until at least 2027, whereas Brampton is almost ready to build right now. That's why we are calling on the company to resume its retool immediately.

This is the worst of corporate behaviour and it cannot be tolerated. There can be no situation where a corporation decides to cut production in this country, ship our jobs to the United States and expect a free ride back in Canada. This cannot happen.

I want to take a moment to thank Industry Minister Joly and her team. The quick and decisive actions that they took last week in holding Stellantis to account for its actions and demanding a resolution in Brampton were outstanding. Similar action was taken, as you know, with General Motors.

I also want to thank our finance minister and his team for the notice that they sent the companies to reduce their tariff remission quotas. It was, in our opinion, the exact right move that was needed.

We don't need corporate excuses. We need plans. We need products. We need commitments to be upheld and everyone needs to learn that there are consequences to broken promises and broken commitments.

As far as our union is concerned, that Jeep Compass program must stay right here in Brampton where it was committed. We will be working toward that end; I can guarantee you that.

Today in Brampton, at this very moment—and tomorrow, too—our members are outside that plant standing up for their jobs, for their futures and for their community, just as they are in Ingersoll. This is the fight of our lives and we need our political leaders to be there with us each and every step of the way.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Payne.

We're going to move to questioning.

Mr. Guglielmin, the floor is yours for six minutes.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Thank you to both of the witnesses for their opening testimony.

Mr. Volpe, your members represent 100,000 Canadian jobs. Without a question, the tariffs are the catalyst for the manufacturing sector, both auto and otherwise.

We've heard testimony on this committee from numerous people associated with the manufacturing and auto industry who cite regulatory issues, tax framework and overall competitiveness issues vis-à-vis the U.S., especially given its aggressive approach to attract business through tax reduction strategy and regulation reduction strategy.

How would you describe Canada's current competitiveness relative to the United States jurisdiction?

• (1755)

Flavio Volpe: Removing tariffs from the conversation, it's very competitive. Obviously, we're dealing with the last Trump administration's approach to corporate tax benefits and the Biden administration's approach to flooding the zone with production subsidies, but in the packages that landed these investments—like the one that we're talking about from Stellantis and General Motors—there were good workarounds.

Also, Canadians buy a lot of cars—up to two million a year. It's also a very valuable market for profitable car companies to participate in.

Michael Guglielmin: Is the EV mandate making it harder for your members to justify new investment here?

Flavio Volpe: You may have heard me say from the beginning that the EV mandate was unachievable, unworkable and not based in reality, although it was noble.

One of two things was going to happen. Companies were going to pour money into earlier programs that were less profitable to meet the targets or they were going to have to buy credits from other companies that don't manufacture in Canada—like Tesla or VinFast—to meet the targets. Both of those were inefficient and would not result in more business for Canadian auto parts suppliers.

Michael Guglielmin: Would you say the EV mandates have caused some unintended consequences for the auto sector?

Flavio Volpe: You can Google me on the record on that. I've been a lot less generous than you were there.

Michael Guglielmin: So would you agree with that, for the record, for this committee?

Flavio Volpe: Yes, sure.

Michael Guglielmin: Do you believe in allowing consumers and industry to decide the pace of transition to EVs and that this sort of approach would strengthen the auto sector overall?

Flavio Volpe: Well, there's a balance to be had. The Canadian economy has some benefits that come from some stretch goals in EVs. They just have to be based in reality.

Canadians should be able to buy whatever they want, and I don't think, up until this first year, 2026, we've offended that principle of a 20% margin. We've implored the government to hold those mandates, review them and change them. They've done that. We are going to hold them to that very closely when the 60-day review period finishes, and there had better be some changes.

Michael Guglielmin: Ms. Payne, at a previous meeting that we had on Monday, we had executives from the auto industry here. They were highlighting a similar thing to Mr. Volpe regarding the EV mandates. They said that federal regulations such as those should be scrapped entirely and were a net-negative to the auto sector. One of them went so far to say that it was actually the one thing the government could do immediately to give immediate relief to the auto sector.

We also heard some similar remarks from the president of Stellantis Canada.

Would you agree with that assessment?

Lana Payne: This isn't the reason that Stellantis is making the decision it's making right now.

The other thing I would say—

Michael Guglielmin: Excuse me, ma'am. That wasn't the question.

The question was, with respect to the EV mandate, do you believe that it should be scrapped and that this would be a benefit to the auto sector?

Lana Payne: My advice to the government is, if they were going to scrap the EV mandate, which they've currently put on pause, they should be getting something for it from these companies—commitments that they need to live up to.

Michael Guglielmin: You, yourself, have said that a mandate alone won't secure the Canadian EV industry. We're talking here about trade policy, which has been a disaster for manufacturing. At the end of every data point is a family, a job at the end of the line, as I know you're very well aware.

If there were something we could do immediately, like get rid of this mandate, would you not agree that we should take that approach?

Lana Payne: I would say to you that you had better get something for it. If you're going to get rid of the mandates, you need to get commitments from the companies that they're going to keep jobs here, as a result.

Michael Guglielmin: Do you believe that there should be enforceable job retention or clawback clauses written into these contracts that the government makes with companies like Stellantis?

• (1800)

Lana Payne: Yes. With any kind of government support for any industry, whether it's the auto industry or the aerospace industry, no matter what you're talking about, there should be strings attached to those investments, including jobs, including Canadian content, including all of the things that we should be demanding when we invest in industrial policy and in industries in Canada.

Michael Guglielmin: Just going off your opening remarks, do you have confidence in what the president of Stellantis said regarding their desire to keep jobs in Brampton and in Canada?

Lana Payne: At this moment, I do not, and I will tell you why. They just violated a commitment to us, and have said that they're shifting the product that was promised and committed to the workers of Brampton to a plant in the United States in order to appease Donald Trump's trade aggression.

There was not one word of commitment that I heard there in terms of whatever other product they're talking about. We already have a product. We already have a committed product and vehicle program for Brampton. That's the one we need to keep there, and the retool needs to restart immediately.

Michael Guglielmin: Thank you. That's all the time I have.

The Chair: Madame O'Rourke, the floor is yours for six minutes.

Dominique O'Rourke: Thank you.

We're all aware of the strength, the productivity and the importance of Canada's auto sector. It represents more than 100,000 direct jobs and more than 500,000 indirect jobs and is Ontario's top exporter.

In Guelph, we are home to Linamar, Magna and DENSO, some of the world's best auto parts manufacturers, so I'm sure, Mr. Volpe, that you've been to Guelph many times.

We're also one of Canada's most vulnerable cities to tariffs. We all want to see section 232 tariffs lifted. We all want the renewal of CUSMA to be the priority. We should all want a team Canada win on this. We want to see Canadian automakers uphold their commitments.

Mr. Hines was talking about certainty. He attributed the move to the U.S. to uncertainty caused by American tariffs. Are the actions of Stellantis themselves...? Does that move itself contribute to the uncertainty in the sector? Should they stand their ground, stand with Canada, stand with the sector and with our auto workers?

Lana Payne: I think it sends the message that if Stellantis can get away with this, everybody can get away with it.

We know that these kinds of decisions are being made in many places right now, not just the auto sector. This is why our union was very propositional in the early days of this trade war and actually recommended to the government a remission plan in terms of how we would deal with production and manufacturing—particularly in the auto sector—in the face of the threats we were facing. It was based on a simple principle, and that is, “If you sell in Canada, you should build in Canada.” If you have a footprint here, and you've made commitments to working people here, and if you've made commitments around investments, you would be given, basically, a quota. If that footprint and those commitments changed, then that whole picture would change for you as a company.

That's what we saw evolve last week.

I get that this is tough to hear, but every day Donald Trump is pressuring corporations in the United States—I have used the word “extortion”—to do exactly what Stellantis is doing right now. If we don't find a way, as a nation, to pressure back and make sure that we keep production in Canada, keep plants going during this period, until we get to a point where we can get a trade deal and the kind of certainty that the president of Stellantis is talking about, then we will lose it all.

This is difficult for our members to hear. I have been honest with all of them about what it is we're currently facing, but the reality is we also have a lot of leverage as a country. We have a lot of ability to be able to secure the auto industry and make sure that we can get through this period. We have to use all of those tools to do exactly that.

Dominique O'Rourke: Thank you.

As chair of the auto caucus, we've had opportunities to visit plants. We met with Unifor at the end of the summer.

This committee has a current study on productivity. I'm imagining that establishing a new product in a factory would take years of planning, investments in retooling and training of the workforce. Does the Stellantis decision make any sense, from a productivity standpoint, this late in the game?

• (1805)

Lana Payne: Absolutely none.

What also doesn't make any sense is that we've had a partial retool at Brampton. That plant is in a much better position to be able to complete the retool and get cars out the door, product out the door, a lot faster. If you noticed and read their news announcement when they announced the \$13-billion investment into the United States, which also included our jobs and our investment that had been committed to in Brampton, they said they were doing this in order to make sure they could get vehicles quickly into the market and into the showrooms. There's no better place to do that than Brampton right now.

Dominique O'Rourke: I certainly hope Mr. Hines is still listening.

Mr. Volpe, I was happy to hear you say that our sector is anchored in assembly. I would agree.

Can you give us an idea what the knock-on effects are for the parts manufacturers, for a decision like Stellantis announced recently?

Flavio Volpe: I was pleased to meet and discuss with you personally these types of dynamics in Guelph, at the Linamar centre for innovation. At that event, we talked about how a job in assembly is usually worth three or four...in auto parts that feed that plant. When you make a car, it's like a "jigsaw puzzle" operation, where 75% of those components are made at supplier factories.

In a plant like Brampton, when it's going at full hum, 3,000 workers, whom Lana represents, are making the cars that I buy. There are about 9,000 or 10,000 workers at auto parts facilities who are making the components that go into that jigsaw puzzle.

We were all waiting for that Compass. In support of the argument that Lana just made, let me add that the \$13-billion announcement included over \$600 million for retooling Belvidere, Illinois. In addition to the amount that was spent in retooling, and icing workers and suppliers in Brampton, they're investing another \$600 million into a product that has a 6% or 7% profit margin.

Productivity is not the reason behind that decision.

Dominique O'Rourke: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For our last question, very quickly, the federal government has, of course, announced that it's taking action on Stellantis. We have also announced a number of supports for our workers in a number of tariff-affected sectors, including enhanced EI, trades training, the regional tariff response initiative, which is \$6.5 billion for new measures to protect Canadian businesses and workers and, of course, the ongoing negotiations.

In your estimation, how critical is it to maintain these measures, and what actions, if any, can the Canadian government take to further stabilize the investment environment for the auto sector?

Lana Payne: I'm never going to argue that we need to have robust supports for workers when they're facing job loss but, in this case, what I would say is that our priority is to make sure that people have jobs and that the plant operates.

We have many elements in our collective agreement. Obviously, you heard Mr. Hines reference these. We have met with them around what continued benefits and income support for our mem-

bers would look like. Let's just say that we're nowhere near a solution to that yet.

The reality is that, to stabilize the industry, there are a number of things we need to do: support production and make sure we're keeping these plants open during this period of time and, obviously, get to a place where we can get a secure trade deal with the United States.

We have leverage here. Canada is a massive market. You heard Flavio speak to this. It's a \$100-billion market. We're the main export market for these companies outside of the United States in terms of where they sell their cars. That should be worth something. This is a critically important place for them not only to build cars but to sell cars. I think that has to factor into the equation here and into the decision-making.

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Ste-Marie, you have the floor for six minutes.

• (1810)

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to welcome all the witnesses.

My questions are for the Unifor representatives, and I thank them for being here.

Your presentation highlights the seriousness of the situation. As you said, Ms. Payne, manufacturing jobs across the Canadian economy are at risk. In particular, you mentioned what's happening at Paccar, in Sainte-Thérèse, in the northern suburbs of Montreal, and the hundreds of jobs that are being lost. Today we're talking about the Stellantis plant in Brampton. It all stems from President Donald Trump's trade war and illegal tariffs.

First of all, do you believe that the U.S. courts will correct the situation by declaring these tariffs illegal? They are indeed illegal, in my opinion.

[English]

Lana Payne: I wish I had a crystal ball for this one.

I would say that there are two types of tariffs we're dealing with. One that the Supreme Court will be looking at is the IEEPA tariffs. Also, what we are facing in terms of the tariffs on the auto industry are the section 232 tariffs, which are different in the context that they come through a different process in the United States.

Of course, those are all subject to our trade negotiations currently with the U.S., because they're the tariffs we see on auto, on steel, on aluminum, on copper and now on heavy-duty trucks, including the ones they would make at PACCAR.

There are many other tariffs or many other trade investigations on sectors that are also currently under way, which is why this is a very difficult time for our economy. We're looking at an aerospace investigation. We are looking at an investigation on pharmaceuticals. There is no end to the number of tariff attacks we've been facing and will continue to face from the United States.

This why our position has been that we have leverage as a country, and we need to think about how we use that leverage going forward if we're not able to get to a trade agreement. Every day, the goalposts appear to change with this president. I think that's something that's very clear, and the demands grow, and the extortion grows. We will therefore have to assess our position going forward and how we get to a deal.

The other thing I know is that the tariffs that the United States have put on us are now causing considerable pain in the U.S. and, as hard as this is to hear, we need that to happen. We need their industries to hurt as a result of the fact that they have a 50% tariff on our aluminum, because they can't build things without us. They can't grow things without us. As a country, we do have a lot of leverage in this trade war, and we need to make sure that we're letting that leverage be known.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: That's very clear. Thank you very much.

They are the two most integrated economies in the world, so Canada has power. You said that until the tariff problems are resolved, the government should take more action by implementing a remission plan to compensate for the tariffs paid and preserve jobs in the manufacturing sector.

With regard to the Brampton plant, what lessons should the federal government learn from the cavalier manner in which Stellantis announced its change in plans to workers and the government? What does the government need to learn from this situation so that it doesn't happen again?

[*English*]

Lana Payne: I think we always have to be prepared to play hardball, that's for sure. What I will say to you is that in previous testimony from Mr. Hines, he mentioned over and over again the third shift that they have hired in the Windsor plant. I just want you all to understand that they are not doing this out of the goodness of their heart. This was something our union negotiated in 2023, the same way we negotiated the commitment for Brampton.

The reality is that we expect these corporations to live up to the commitments they make. If there becomes a period in time...because conditions change. The way forward there is to sit down with the union and try to figure out a way through this, and potentially with government partners as well.

That did not occur here with Brampton. We found out 15 minutes before. That's why there were the robocalls. All of this was happening at the same time. Our union was notified 15 minutes before this was made public. Right up until that period, we were being told over and over again that they were committed to Brampton and that this product would be going to Brampton. Within a span of less than an hour, our members were getting robocalls. We went through a period of eight months when we were telling this company that

they had to do a much better job of communicating to their loyal workforce about what was happening during that eight months. The communication that our members received was from us, not the company.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: I'm sorry, I'm going to choose my words carefully in the few seconds I have left, but I think Stellantis' approach is disgusting. Fortunately, the union was there to inform and support workers. I imagine that the community's trust has been broken.

My time is up, but I will certainly have another opportunity to ask you questions.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*English*]

Madam Dancho, the floor is yours for five minutes.

Raquel Dancho: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being here.

Just briefly, Mr. Volpe, you are here representing the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association, which I believe represents 250 big companies in many parts and 90% of Canadian auto parts manufacturers. I didn't actually get how many jobs you represent in total, but I know it's several thousand.

Flavio Volpe: It's about 100,000.

Raquel Dancho: That's a lot: 100,000. Thank you very much for your advocacy on behalf of those workers.

My understanding is that in Brampton it certainly impacted 3,000 direct jobs, but I have heard that it impacted as many as 12,000 indirect jobs, many of them in your sector, the auto parts sector. Is that correct?

Flavio Volpe: That's correct. When that plant is operating at full capacity, there are about 9,000 or 10,000 jobs in suppliers, in that region and then the rest of Ontario, that supply that production. Those jobs without cars there do not exist.

Raquel Dancho: Yes. I just wanted to confirm that, because you represent a significant number of workers. Thank you for that.

Ms. Payne, I have similar questions for you. Of course, Unifor, as you well know, represents many auto workers, but how many in general?

Lana Payne: We have 40,000 members in the auto sector. They would work in assembly plants and also for some of the suppliers that Flavio represents. When you speak about Stellantis and the Brampton decision, we also had about 1,000 members in the supply chain who were impacted by this decision. Then there would have been thousands more who potentially were not part of our union. It's a significant impact.

Raquel Dancho: Yes. From what you've said in some of what I've read, and you might have said it today as well, we can easily classify this as a crisis for our auto sector. To paraphrase what you said—correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought it was quite impactful—we will lose it all in terms of our auto sector if we don't get a trade deal.

Lana Payne: Yes. I mean, I think there are many ways we can do things right now. We have worked with these auto companies through what has been a very difficult situation. Some of them are investing still in Canada. What I fear, and this is why we have been promoting the fact that this is an industry where a tariff is going to cause a continued loss of investment in the industry, is that, to your point, without the investment, without new product going into these plants, you don't have a future. The investment right now is very limited and is based on previous times. We have seen a lot of new investment being announced, all of it going to the United States at this moment.

Raquel Dancho: Yes, I'm glad you brought up the tariffs. Of course, this is a huge part of what we're dealing with, as many of you have outlined in this study that we're doing.

I think what I'm quite concerned about, and I'm sure you've seen what I've seen, is that the communications from the Trump administration are quite serious. They're in essence saying this is their goal. They want to bleed us dry of our auto sector. I'm paraphrasing their words, but that's my read of their goal. It's pretty ruthless, and it's impacting thousands of jobs already, and we're only a few months in, so to speak.

I'm also concerned, though, that we aren't hearing a confident communication in any way from the Liberal government that they are going to deliver an auto deal for Canadians. We have not heard those communications. It has not been prioritized in their communications, so I'm very concerned that we are just at the beginning of this and that it's going to be quite some time before we get an auto deal, if we ever get one.

I think what we're trying to figure out is if there's anything we can do within our domestic sole control to make the auto sector more competitive here so we can hope to keep some jobs. I know that you mentioned mandates previously regarding the pause and that they were necessary given unprecedented challenges facing domestic industry. This move provides temporary relief to an industry reeling from Trump's tariffs. I appreciate that you appreciate the temporary relief.

I would argue that a permanent relief would do even more for some of the certainty that's required and, Mr. Volpe, I know that you've classified to the Toronto Star the mandate as “economic punishment”, and we couldn't agree more. We've heard this at length, Mr. Chair, from a number of witnesses about the EV mandates. I really do believe that they're like a noose hanging over the auto sector's head. Surely we can do something to help support them right now.

I will move the following motion, Mr. Chair. I move:

Given that the federal Liberal Electric Vehicle mandate is currently paused but not repealed, and may be reinstated following the government's ongoing review;

Given that the mandate:

Reduces consumer choice and affordability, with electric vehicles costing around \$15,000 more than comparable gas models, and winter range losses of up to 40% affecting rural and northern drivers;

Does not reflect consumer demand, as electric vehicles made up only 8.7% of new vehicle sales in early 2025, a 23% drop from the previous year;

Is out of step with the U.S. market, where no comparable federal sales mandate exists and automakers are given greater flexibility to meet consumer demand;

Upon reinstatement, would require automakers to meet strict quotas—60% zero-emission sales by 2030 and 100% by 2035—or face penalties of up to \$20,000 per vehicle;

Would once again channel millions in compliance payments to foreign companies like Tesla, instead of supporting Canadian automakers and jobs;

Has been criticized by industry experts, including: Huw Williams of the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association, who called the EV mandate “a pending disaster” and stated: “If you want to help Tesla, and not your local car dealer, keep the EV mandate”; and Brian Kingston of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers Association who called it “a direct challenge to our competitiveness as an auto manufacturing jurisdiction because it is levying punitive costs on companies that do not achieve these arbitrary sales targets”;

That the committee report to the House its recommendation that the federal Liberal Electric Vehicle mandate be abolished.

Mr. Chair, we feel quite strongly about this, and I look forward to the discussion.

• (1820)

The Chair: I'll just seek clarity from you, Madam Dancho. Are you moving notice or you are moving the motion?

Raquel Dancho: I'm moving the motion.

The Chair: You're moving the motion.

Colleagues, I note that I have three hands raised over here.

I'd like to make a recommendation to the committee, and should colleagues not accept that recommendation, that's fine. We'll abide by the Standing Orders.

We have three witnesses with us. We have about 12 to 15 minutes of testimony left. If we get into a long, drawn-out discussion or even a discussion of any kind on this motion, that is going to either prevent us from speaking to the witnesses further, or it is going to mean that the witnesses have to sit here, wait and listen to us deal with committee-related business that was not the reason they were brought here today.

Here's what I would like to recommend. We allow for the line of questioning to continue, and we agree with unanimous consent that we will honour the moving of Madam Dancho's motion, which we will engage on once we're finished our line of questioning, so that we can make full use of the expertise of the witnesses who have made themselves available to us today. Following the conclusion of that, we will resume debate on this motion.

In order for us to do that, I'm going to need unanimous consent from the membership.

Go ahead, Madam Dancho.

Raquel Dancho: How long will we have to discuss it?

The Chair: We have to discuss it as long as there is to discuss it.

Raquel Dancho: There's no cut-off from them.

The Chair: There's no cut-off whatsoever. All I'm suggesting is that instead of having what could be a 10, 15, 20, or 60-minute long discussion with witnesses still here let's finish the predetermined allotted amount of time out of respect to them and the members who still have time remaining. Then we can agree as a committee that we will resume to the motion that you've moved.

Raquel Dancho: I have one more question. I believe we had hands up here so we have a speaking order.

The Chair: I will honour the speaking order that was attempted to be established here, which I have as Mr. Falk, Ms. Borrelli, Mr. Guglielmin. I will resume that speaking order and commence it once we finish the allotted time we've set aside for witnesses.

I'm just looking for consent from the committee. Simply put, I don't want the witnesses to have to wait around while we have a discussion about this because they've made themselves available. Certainly Mr. Volpe, Mr. DiCaro and Ms. Payne have a lot on their plate, a lot of people to talk to, and I don't want to hold them up any further.

In that case, Madam Dancho, we will return to your motion upon the conclusion of questioning. Your time has expired.

Mr. Bardeesy, the floor is yours for five minutes, please.

• (1825)

Karim Bardeesy: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I put a question to Mr. Hines about the productivity of the Brampton plant.

I'm wondering Ms. Payne, or Mr. DiCaro, if you have some further comments or data to support their views on the productivity of that plant.

Lana Payne: Angelo.

Angelo DiCaro (Director of Research, Unifor): I appreciate the question. I don't know how detailed you want me to be on this. It's fair to say, and I would imagine any Stellantis official would agree with me, that that plant has been in operation for 40 years and it has been an exceptionally productive plant. They've entrusted that plant to build the vehicles that Mr. Volpe buys, not just because Mr. Volpe is buying them, but because they are hugely profitable vehicles. That plant for a long time has been the sole-source factory for some of the most lucrative muscle cars in the Dodge lineup. They were very proud of building those cars.

If you have seen a Dodge Charger within the last 20 years, it was only ever built in one facility in the world and that's Brampton, Ontario. You don't trust a bad plant to build your most important cars. That's why that plant is so critically important.

Karim Bardeesy: Thank you for that.

As a follow-up question, did the question of an electric vehicle availability standard ever get in the way of those Chargers being produced?

Angelo DiCaro: I'll say no. The bigger issue, if I'm being honest, with product portfolios to meet electric vehicle or fuel economy standards stems from the U.S. EPA rules on fuel economy. Canada builds cars for the North American market. If they change the regulations in the U.S. for fuel economy we follow those rules. That has had a more influential impact on the shift in production than any other policy that we're aware of. The Brampton lineup of cars was winding down before we were even having a conversation about EV mandates in Canada frankly. It's hard to test that against that policy. That's the best I can tell you.

Karim Bardeesy: After the restructuring of the sector in the aftermath of the financial crisis, there was significant federal government, Ontario government and U.S. federal government assistance to two of the major companies. As part of those assistance packages your workers, your members, had to make some significant sacrifices. I also recall in that period that there was a lot of alignment between Unifor and the sector to jointly advocate for new mandates. Can you just tell a bit of the story about how the sector was working together with the union for a long period of time and perhaps what has changed in just the last few months?

Lana Payne: I would say we still work together with the sector when we can, because we want to have a robust auto sector in Canada, and that means we work with automakers and with Flavio and his organization. We try to make sure we can promote an auto sector for Canada, because it's so critically important to having an advanced manufacturing base in this country, to the industrial base of Canada and to 500,000 Canadians who depend on it for their employment. Therefore, we will find a time when we will work together, again, on all of the policies that we need to work on, to make sure we have an industry that is supported and able to grow. I believe we will get to that place once we get through this difficult period.

The reality is that we build cars together across North America, and the U.S. depends on us in order to build the cars they build there too, and they depend on our market. Eventually, I really hope saner heads prevail here and we continue to have a great North American auto industry.

• (1830)

Karim Bardeesy: Thank you.

I have a question for Mr. Volpe—

The Chair: Be very quick, Mr. Bardeesy.

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Volpe, Ms. Payne just spoke a bit to the role of Minister Joly and the industry folks in advocacy during these last few weeks. I'm just wondering whether you could share your views on that advocacy, from your perspective.

Flavio Volpe: We asked the Minister of Industry to take a really firm stance on the covenants that Stellantis and General Motors signed with the federal government, to the benefit of both those companies, but also suppliers, workers and the communities alike. We thought the response was very firm and very quick. In the remission order move, together with Minister Champagne, I think we have the attention of the decision-makers there, who are not happy about that, but I think it was a very important articulation of the leverage we have—Lana talked about the \$100-billion market they sell into.

Look, if you're going to get tariff remissions because you're building here and, then, you decide not to build here, then you're going to be like Nissan, Hyundai and everybody else who wants to sell here. I appreciate the very strong leadership and response in that matter.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ste-Marie, you have two and a half minutes.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Payne and Mr. DiCaro, what lessons can the government learn from this story in terms of how it structures its industrial policy? Should the government demand more job or investment guarantees, for the well-being of workers in communities, when it takes measures and develops policies to support large businesses in the manufacturing sector? What lessons can the government learn from this story in order to implement better industrial policies in the future?

[*English*]

Lana Payne: Whenever we're hit with a moment like this, we will always argue that government should have strong industrial policy and support sectors, like the auto and aerospace industry, and make sure we're doing all of the things we can do—a modern nation must do that. However, when you're in a moment like this, you should pause to look and examine, “What did we do? What can we do better?” We should always do this. What policies can we improve upon? Can we strengthen the strings that are attached to the investments that companies receive? If so, what does that look like? Yes, I would say that this is a good moment to look back at all of that and say, “How can we improve?” Maybe we can't, but it is worth a review and examination. I think it's a responsible thing to do.

Angelo DiCaro: I will add one supplement to this because I think it's a great question on the lessons we have to learn about building an industrial strategy.

I'm going to set aside the criticism and the opaqueness of the covenants struck. These are not public documents, so I'll set aside the confidentiality implications of having these agreements. We'll save that for another time.

The mechanisms that have been put in place, these very detailed application-based funding mechanisms frustrate a lot of employers because it takes time and they have to sign a lot of paperwork to do these things. However, it shows that this has actually been proven useful because we have a stake now, when we wouldn't have had a stake in a different policy formation. I'll give you an example of

that, and that is giving blanket tax cuts to companies. The shift to investment tax credits, within the EV approach we've taken as a country, comes with speed, efficiencies and a lot of risk because we cannot hold those companies to account, like we are doing right now. I think that's a lesson that has to be taken and explored further.

I'm glad to see that this new strategic response fund is taking a page from the strategic innovation fund in its makeup, and we aren't going too deep into a different model of tax cuts without strings attached.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

[*English*]

Ms. Borelli, the floor is yours for five minutes.

● (1835)

Kathy Borrelli: Thank you, Chair.

Ms. Payne, Stellantis and other automakers have received record public subsidies. Do you think the federal and Ontario governments negotiated strong enough job retention clauses, or should future agreements include clawback provisions if employment promises are not met?

Lana Payne: I haven't seen the agreements. Maybe you all have in camera, but I certainly haven't seen them. I've been very clear that I think when we're looking at investing in any industry in Canada that we have to look at having strings attached with respect to employment, and making sure that we have Canadian content, all of the things that you would consider in terms of making sure that our economy gets the best of those investments.

Kathy Borrelli: Can you comment on how Unifor is working to ensure that women in the skilled trades and manufacturing have equal access to the new Windsor battery plant jobs?

Lana Payne: We do a lot of work in the skilled trades space, as you can imagine. We have about 50,000 members who work in the skilled trades in thousands of workplaces across the country. We negotiate skilled trades apprenticeships in many of our workplaces. We encourage and use any ability that we can in terms of trying to make sure that women have access to those opportunities as well.

For example, I just spoke to a number of our women in the skilled trades with our Suncor facility in Fort McMurray. This is something that we do: we work together with employers. We've done this robustly with the shipyard in Halifax as well where we've seen the number of women in the skilled trades increase by leaps and bounds because of the partnership between our union and the employer, and government and colleges. We do it across the spectrum. We use collective bargaining obviously as a tool to be able to do that. We also have an education program in Port Elgin where we teach several times a year and introduce women to the skilled trades, to make sure that we're doing that. Our locals do a tremendous job in the community, including in your community of Windsor, to hold skilled trades fairs and make sure that women see that this is a place for them.

Kathy Borrelli: Thank you.

Mr. DiCaro, based on your policy modelling, what long-term productivity or wage gains can Windsor expect from Stellantis's EV transition, and what risks remain if demand for EVs underperforms?

Angelo DiCaro: I don't know how much modelling I have to share with you on this. I can give you just my assessment and analysis of it.

I think you can take your question, and you can expand that to any transitioning auto factory. There is a very unstable market right now, and part of it is consumer-driven in early phases of what is going to be a very monumental and significant change in the technology of vehicles. Part of it is consumer-driven, but a lot of it is policy-driven, mostly from the United States. We have a president who campaigned to upend momentum in the electric vehicle market, which I will say, if I can be so bold, is maybe the biggest mistake and the biggest tragedy of this period right now that we're facing. I worry, because we were already behind in this transition in the face of countries like China that are far more advanced. If we don't move forward, we'll be having a very different conversation, I think, at this industry committee in 15 years. It will be "are we still building cars", because it's a different landscape.

I worry about that quite a bit. I think that the Windsor assembly plant has already made moves to address some of the market dynamics. They've resequenced their rollout of some of the Charger EVs that they have. Now they're moving back into the gas-powered version. I think they're adapting, but yes, there are going to be some concerns that go along with that.

• (1840)

Lana Payne: Can I just add one point to this?

One thing we did through collective bargaining was make sure we're looking at platforms in our plants that are flexible, so they can produce the ICE and they can produce full EV models or hybrids. Really, what you need are facilities that are putting in platforms that are able to shift based on shifts in the market demand.

The more flexible our workplaces are to be able to do that, the more they're able to adapt to market changes.

Kathy Borrelli: Mr. Volpe, Windsor's economy depends heavily on parts manufacturing, with thousands of jobs tied to Stellantis and feeder plants.

What percentage of the Windsor-Essex supply chain currently stands to benefit directly from the NextStar project? Are local suppliers being prioritized in the procurement?

Flavio Volpe: That's a very specific question. I don't have the exact percentage for you, but I would say it's a material amount. It's the most important local investment in assembly or major sub-assembly.

The local suppliers are advantaged by being close to the plant. The logistics of supplying a facility like that means the biggest items that cost the most to move and ship are usually located close by.

I'm not sure there's anything in their procurement strategy that says, "Hey, by the way, we have to do Windsor-Essex suppliers first." That's why it's important to note that those Windsor-Essex suppliers are extremely productive, efficient and aggressive in business development because they need to be. It's a dog-eat-dog world and we have a globally relevant cluster of suppliers there.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Borrelli.

Ms. Sidhu, you have five minutes.

Sonia Sidhu: Ms. Payne and Mr. DiCaro, I got a chance to meet you in Windsor. Thank you for standing up with the workers.

Mr. Volpe, thank you so much for looking after 250 companies and for supporting 90% of the workers.

I was at the Unifor rally last month in Brampton because I'm from Brampton. I feel the pain and how the workers are feeling that their rights are violated. They feel betrayal.

We were listening to Mr. Hines when I asked a question and he said that they'll give them the chance to move to Windsor.

What is your thought about that? How can they be supported in Windsor if they're working in Brampton and their life is in Brampton? What kind of support system is that?

Lana Payne: Our members in Brampton want to work in Brampton. That is their home. That is their community. That's where they've raised their families. That's not to say that we haven't seen auto workers go from one community to another, given the history of the industry—particularly what we went through in 2008 to 2010.

Again, this isn't a gift. We negotiate transfers in our collective agreement. This is something that is available to our members in Brampton, should they wish to do it. It isn't something the company is making available; it is because we have collective agreement language that allows it to occur.

Their priority and my priority would be to get the retooling back on track and get people working. Then that plant is ready on the other side of this trade war—because there is going to be another side to it—and they can produce vehicles immediately.

That is where the priority of our union is.

Sonia Sidhu: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I want to pass my time to my colleague.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: You said you were blindsided by the deal. Up to the eleventh hour there was false assurance after false assurance. We heard assurances today, if you could call them that, saying, “Oh, we’re still committed to Brampton. We’re still committed to building something. We don’t know what, we don’t know when, but trust us, we’re still committed”.

Do you trust them?

Lana Payne: Let’s just say I know the power of our union and what we are going to be doing to make sure they live up to Brampton and to our members. We’re going to be relentless here. We have to be. We’re fighting for those jobs and so many others across our country.

The reality is that Stellantis continues to want to sell vehicles in Canada. This is an important market to them. That should mean something at the end of the day.

I can tell you what I know we will do. We’re going to put every effort and everything we can into making sure they live up to the commitment to our membership.

• (1845)

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: They made a commitment to your membership, and you’ve talked about betrayal. They also made a commitment to Canada, though.

Lana Payne: They did.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: They made a commitment to the federal government and to the provincial government here in Ontario, and they accepted dollars. They accepted taxpayer dollars, public dollars, to say that they’re committed to this place, that they will stay here and that they’re committed to this plan. You heard him. He said, “It’s a home.” He said that they have a “proud” history here and that they hope to have a proud future here.

Workers, I understand, feel betrayal. However, if you’re a Canadian sitting there watching Donald Trump’s unjustified attacks against our country, against auto workers and beyond, and you have a company that then turns heel, effectively, and says that it’s going to put its short-term economic interests—country be damned—ahead of our national interests, what should you, as a Canadian, be thinking?

Lana Payne: I appreciate that you raise this question because it is something that I have been saying to automakers since February or March, when all of this started. I’ve been telling them to be very careful here in this environment. Canadians are still very angry. They’re very angry at the situation that we find ourselves in, and their neighbours are now losing their jobs. The reality is that Canadians have been organically acting with their pocketbooks. This is the environment that we’re in. Automakers and all corporations need to understand that.

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Thanks very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. DiCaro, Ms. Payne and Mr. Volpe.

I think that all of us, in a non-partisan capacity here, can empathize very much with those you represent and with how difficult a moment we are in as a country. Certainly, you are all on the front lines of this. To make yourselves available to this committee on short notice and at a time when your attention and your energy is demanded in a variety of different places at the same time.... We are extremely appreciative of the insight and the guidance you provided us with today. Thank you very much for that.

Witnesses, you are dismissed.

Colleagues, we are now going to, as committed, get into the motion that was moved by Madam Dancho earlier in the hour.

Mr. Falk, the floor is yours.

Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my colleague, Ms. Dancho, for putting forward this motion. I think she’s clearly given the rationale as to why this motion should be adopted by this committee.

For those people watching the committee I would like to reiterate what the ask is without reading the entire motion.

The ask is very simple: that the committee report to the House, that being the House of Commons, its recommendation that the federal, Liberal, electric vehicle mandate be abolished.

If we go back in time a little bit to 2021 when Justin Trudeau and the Liberal government first announced their plan for an EV mandate, that’s when things actually began to happen. The Liberal government obviously didn’t do its homework properly and didn’t realize what the impact of an electric vehicle mandate would do to the auto industry here in Canada.

Today we’re seeing the fallout of that. Multiple witnesses at committee have told us that a substantial impact on the decision that Stellantis will have made in shutting the Brampton plant and moving production of the Jeep Compass to Illinois was the fact that there was an EV mandate here.

Instead of giving Elon Musk billions of dollars in carbon tax offset credits.... For those who followed the industry a little bit, in the last quarter Tesla received \$600 million in carbon tax credits from other automakers, and the quarter that we just came through, or prior to that, it was \$700 million in carbon tax credits. That’s over \$2 billion a year the industry is giving to Tesla that is leaving Canada and padding the pockets of Elon Musk.

I think the necessity of this motion is also brought on by the fact that Prime Minister Carney and his ministers, Minister Joly, Minister Champagne and Minister LeBlanc, have failed to negotiate tariff relief with the United States government. Every time that they seem to communicate with the Americans things seem to get worse here in Canada. When they tried to implement a counter-tariff, it lasted about 48 hours, and when they tried to bring in a tax on the tech giants, it lasted less than 24 hours.

What we see over and over again is Prime Minister Carney backing down to President Trump and every time it seems to cost us more money. After the last visit that Mr. Carney had with President Trump, we see that he came back having made half-a-trillion-dollar investment commitment into the United States. He did this knowing that \$60 billion of capital had already fled our country into foreign markets. Then he promised Donald Trump a \$500-billion investment in the United States coming from Canada. He should be worried about Canadian investment, not investing in the United States.

Yesterday we learned that the only winner from this last visit was Brookfield with an \$80-billion contract two weeks after our Prime Minister visited with President Trump. Wow. That's a big thank you to Canadians and to Canadian auto workers.

Conservatives stand strongly in the corner of the Canadian auto workers, with the workers of Stellantis who were anticipating that they would have a plant reopening and that they would be producing the Jeep Compass. For years and years they produced the hallmark muscle cars of the Stellantis brand with the Dodge Charger and the Dodge Challenger. These were excellent products and the workers were extremely proud. While we sat here in committee listening to testimony I googled the picture of the employees standing beside the last Dodge Challenger that was made in the Brampton plant, which was a Dodge Challenger Demon 170, a totally black car. The workers stood around, they took pictures, they applauded, and they celebrated the workmanship of that plant in producing a phenomenal muscle car.

These were proud auto workers, proud of the work they had done, proud of the product they had produced, and they should be. Now they're faced with this. Why are they faced with a robocall advising them that they wouldn't have work? It's because this Liberal government failed to deal with the trade situation that we have with the United States.

• (1850)

They failed to get any elimination of tariffs. They failed to get any concessions. This wasn't a decision that was made last month by Stellantis. We heard from President Hines of Stellantis that he had been in discussions with both Unifor and the Liberal government the last nine months. This wasn't a decision that was made overnight. They had nine months to come up with a solution, but the Liberal government failed. Now there are 3,000 workers in the Stellantis plant that are looking towards Christmas and wondering how they're going to make that a celebration for their families. This isn't fair to those auto workers. This Liberal government has hugely failed them, and it needs to make things right.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk.

Ms. Borrelli, the floor is yours.

Kathy Borrelli: Thank you, Chair.

Colleagues, I want to be clear right from the start: This motion is not about opposing electric vehicles. Conservatives support innovation, consumer choice and Canadian-made technology. What we do oppose is a federal Liberal EV mandate, a policy that punishes workers and families, undermines our manufacturing competitive-

ness and threatens the livelihoods of thousands of Canadian auto workers, particularly in Windsor, the heart of Canada's automotive industry.

We heard it loud and clear from our witnesses: The average electric vehicle costs \$15,000 more than a comparable gas-powered vehicle. As Huw Williams told this committee just days ago, it's "a pending disaster", and he's right.

This mandate doesn't help the average family; it helps foreign corporations and the ultrawealthy who can afford a \$70,000 car and a home charging station.

When the government tells automakers what to build instead of letting consumers decide what to buy, the result is simple: fewer cars on lots, fewer choices and higher prices. That means more families priced out of owning a vehicle altogether. In Windsor, where our local economy was built on auto manufacturing, this mandate represents yet another threat to good-paying union and non-union jobs. Right now, unemployment in Windsor is 10.4%, which is the highest in the country. We've seen Stellantis move production of the Jeep Compass from Brampton to Illinois, putting 3,000 Canadian jobs at risk. Our parts manufacturers, many of them small and family-owned, are struggling under the uncertainty created by this government's industrial policy.

For Windsor, it isn't just about cars; it's about the survival of an entire regional economy that depends on the freedom to build, sell and export vehicles that Canadians actually want to buy. Ending the federal mandate sends the right signal: that we believe in market-driven innovation, not government coercion, and that we trust consumers, not bureaucrats, to choose what works best for them.

Abolishing this mandate doesn't mean walking away from clean technology; it means replacing ideology with practicality and ensuring the transition to cleaner transportation happens with Canadian workers, not at their expense.

Mr. Chair, this motion is about standing up for affordability for families, choice for consumers and jobs for workers, especially in Windsor-Essex and Brampton. It's about saying yes to innovation but no to mandates that drive prices up and jobs out. If the government truly stands firmly with its auto workers, it should prove it by scrapping this failed policy and replacing it with a made-in-Canada plan that protects both our environment and our manufacturing heartland.

Thank you.

• (1855)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Borrelli.

Mr. Guglielmin, you have the floor.

Michael Guglielmin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Colleagues, we're here at an emergency debate about the auto sector. We're here because unjustified, unprovoked tariffs are slaughtering our auto industry and, frankly, our broader manufacturing industry. I'm hearing from businesses connected to the auto industry in the supply chain that they're already starting shift reductions. They're cutting hours. They're cutting shifts.

Like I've said multiple times, and it's definitely worth repeating here at this committee, these aren't just numbers. They aren't just statistics. These are people. These are families. That's why we've put this motion before the committee today. For the record, the motion we're putting forward to the committee is that this committee would report to the House that we cancel the EV mandate immediately.

We've heard expert witness testimony at this committee. We've had the Canadian Automobile Dealer Association head here, Huw Williams, who said that the EV mandate is "a pending disaster". We have had Brian Kingston of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers Association here. Brian Kingston said that this is the one simple thing we could do to breathe some life into the automotive industry. We could do it right now. He also called the EV mandate "a direct challenge" to our competitiveness. Mr. Volpe, who just testified at this committee this evening, said EV that mandates are "not based in reality".

A study by the Canadian Journal of Economics found that Prime Minister Carney's EV mandate would kill 38,000 jobs by its fifth year and would likely cause the collapse of Canada's automotive sector. Can you imagine that, on top of these unjustified tariffs and all the issues surrounding the trade policy environment vis-à-vis the United States?

So far, we've seen that it doesn't seem like our government is able to get a deal on auto with the Americans. We've heard them signal as much south of the border. The question would become, why would we have an ideologically driven EV mandate that has no practical benefit to the auto sector? Clearly the game has changed. Clearly we're under threat. Clearly we need to take a common-sense approach to this.

It's not just auto industry executives and people connected to the industry who are saying this. Almost 50 mayors across Ontario have called for the EV mandate to be scrapped.

Conservatives want to scrap this mandate because it's the right approach. It's the right thing to do. It's based on expert testimony. It's a common-sense approach to restore affordability. More importantly, it's an approach that will protect workers. That's why we're here. We're here for the auto industry. We're here to protect auto workers, and we stand firmly on the side of auto workers. We'll continue to advocate to ensure that they have a safe future, that their families can feel assured that the government is doing everything it can to protect their security, their job and, by default, their family.

That is why I'd like to end by saying that clearly, based on the witness testimony we have heard at this committee, we need to scrap this EV mandate immediately. I fully support this motion, and I hope that all members can agree that it's time to move forward.

End this destructive, disastrous policy for the benefit of all Canadian workers.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1900)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Ste-Marie, go ahead, please.

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The federal EV mandate is currently suspended. We in the Bloc Québécois have spoken out against this choice. We think the most important crisis right now is climate change, which is increasingly affecting people's lives in many ways. Adaptation measures will be needed. However, my party and I believe that strong measures and policies are needed now to fight climate change. The issue of electric vehicles won't solve the climate crisis, far from it. We need a whole set of strong measures. However, we support the idea that the government should impose EV targets on manufacturers; otherwise, their adaptation will be far too slow to respond to the current crisis.

Obviously, I won't be able to support the motion. Again, I want to reiterate that we think the obligation should not simply be suspended, let alone repealed, but rather maintained. Next, we must be pragmatic, of course, and look at what the Americans, in this case President Trump, are doing. There was a strategy in place when former President Biden was in power. We need to be smart and manage to successfully readjust. However, we have to keep in mind that the climate change crisis is of the utmost importance among the crises that threaten us.

Furthermore, President Trump may make speeches and implement policies against environmental measures, but the fact remains that states have the power to act, and some are doing so. I want to remind committee members that, for example, California has a carbon market partnership with Quebec. In terms of the economy, the GDPs of California and Quebec combined are greater than the GDPs of Canada as a whole. The states of Washington and the Oregon want to join this carbon market. Even if the current president doesn't want to take action to limit climate change, it is still possible to take action, whether at the North American level or, more broadly, at the global level.

For our part, we're asking government representatives not to suspend this obligation, but to reinstate it in a pragmatic way. I will therefore vote against the motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

Ms. O'Rourke, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Dominique O'Rourke: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just moments ago, we were galvanized and all together with the auto sector and the auto workers. That was the purpose of this particular study that we supported.

Now we're going to argue about the availability of electric vehicles, which I think is a different conversation and does not serve the purposes of this meeting. We have not heard from the entire sector. There is an electric vehicle industry, and we are the industry committee that should hear from more folks.

I will just put some facts on the record, as well. "Electric car sales exceeded 17 million globally in 2024, reaching a sales share of more than 20% globally." "Electric car sales in 2025 are expected to exceed 20 million worldwide to represent more than one-quarter of cars sold worldwide."

These trends are very clear. "Prior to the reduction observed in the first quarter of 2025, zero emission vehicles...continued to increase their share of new vehicles sold in Canada, reaching 15% of total new motor vehicle registrations in 2024...." "ZEVs were responsible for 60% of the net increase in total vehicle registrations in Canada in 2024 and accounted for one in seven new vehicles sold that year. But, depending on the region [where you are] that number was as high as one in three or one in four...."

There is a clear trend. There is clear demand.

Encouraging from Toyota Canada were August 2025 sales. You have to remember that we're trying to compare a 10-year technology to a 100-year internal combustion engine technology. Toyota Canada said, "August sales were up 14.4% [year over year] with 21,848 units sold, helped by strong demand for its electrified vehicles, representing 49.1% of all units sold."

I could go on. What I will add is that no car maker had a 20% target for 2026. Early compliance credits and 2024-25 sales meant an effective compliance target for 2026 around 14%, and we were already there as a sector.

A number of things have disrupted the adoption of electric vehicles in Canada, including the tariffs and the current climate. Even

with the headwinds, Q1 2025 EV sales were up over 100% compared to Q1 2023, despite higher interest rates, trade uncertainties and the abrupt end of purchase incentives.

As members of the industry committee, we should want to see this kind of growth in all our sectors. Legacy automakers sometimes claim that EVAS disproportionately benefits certain automakers, but GM has a higher EV market share than Tesla.

This is not the focus of this study today, which is serious to people in Brampton and to people in the auto sector. I think we should give this particular study its due.

No notice of motion was provided for this motion today. We do not, as an industry committee, have a thorough understanding of this sector, having heard from two witnesses and having cherry-picked their responses.

There is a serious review under way of EVAS, which has been suspended. That is being done in broad consultation and understanding of the context. It is not productive to presuppose the outcome of that consultation. We know that 2026 requirements are suspended. We do that consultation with full knowledge of the changing context.

In light of that, Mr. Chair, I do now move that the committee now adjourn.

• (1905)

The Chair: Okay, colleagues. As you know, a motion to adjourn is a dilatory motion, meaning that there is no further debate.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 5; nays 4)

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>